VOLUME XXXIV No. 4

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL S. CARDOZO THOMAS T. McAVOY THOMAS P. NEILL
WILLIAM L. DAVIS ROBERT F. McNAMARA GEORGE J. UNDREINER

Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1949

ARTICLES

British Public Opinion and the Kulturkampf in Germany, 1871-1875 . . . . *Francis A. Arlinghaus* 385

Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. II. . . . . *Francis P. Cassidy* 414

MISCELLANY

The Manuscripts of St. Aelred . *Carleton M. Sage* 437

BOOK REVIEWS 446

NOTES AND COMMENTS 492

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 500

BOOKS RECEIVED 507

BOOK REVIEWS

L'église au pouvoir des laiques, 888-1057. (Émile Amann and Auguste Dumas). HENRY G. J. BECK 446
L'église à l'époque du concile de Trente. (L. Cristiani). ROBERT H. LORD 447
La monarchie française et la provision des bénéfices ecclésiastiques en Alsace. (René Metz). HARRY C. KOENIG 449
Missionnaires belges sous l'ancien régime (1500-1800). (Joseph Masson). WILLIAM J. PRICE 450
Young Mr. Newman. (Maisie Ward). GEORGIANA P. MCENTEE 451
L'église de France et la révolution de 1848. (Jean Leflon). HENRY W. CASPER 452
The Church and Freemasonry in Brazil, 1872-1875: A Study in Regalism. (Sister Mary Crescentia Thornton). PETER MASTEN DUNNE 454
Organized Religion in the United States. (Ray H. Abrams). THOMAS T. MCAVOY 455
The American Churches. An Interpretation. (William Warren Sweet). HUGH J. NOLAN 456
Old Saint Patrick's, New York's First Cathedral. (Mother Mary Peter Carthy). JOSEPH M. EGAN 459
The Life of James Roosevelt Bayley, First Bishop of Newark and Eighth Archbishop of Baltimore, 1814-1877. (Sister M. Hildegarde Yeager). WILLIAM J. O'SHEA 460
A New Assisi. The First Hundred Years of the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1849-1949. (Sister M. Eunice Hanousek). THEODORE ROEMER 462
Dalle Montagne Rocciose al Rio Bravo. Brevi appunti storici circa la missione gesuitica del Nuovo Messico e Colorado negli Stati Uniti di America. (Giuseppe M. Sorrentino). JOHN B. WUEST 463
Configurations of Culture Growth. (A. L. Kroeber). MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE 464
The Meaning of Human History. (Morris R. Cohen). GEORGE B. FLAHIFF 469
Man and the State. (William Ebenstein). WALDEMAR GURIAN 471
A History of Portugal. (H. V. Livermore). WILLIAM B. GREENLEE 472
Total Power: A Footnote to History. (Edmund A. Walsh). WALDEMAR GURIAN 473
The Capture of Damietta. By Oliver of Paderborn. (John J. Gavigan). JEREMIAH F. O'SULLIVAN 475
The Divine Comedy. A New Translation into English Blank Verse. (Lawrence Grant White). GERALD G. WALSH 476
Nicholaus of Autrecourt. A Study in Fourteenth Century Thought. (Julius Rudolph Weinberg). JOHN J. GLANVILLE 478
The Merchant Class of Medieval London (1300-1500). (Sylvia Thrupp). EUGENE H. BYRNE 479
The Social Structure in Caroline England. (David Mathew). CLARENCE J. RYAN 481
The Faith of Reason. The Idea of Progress in the French Enlightenment. (Charles Frankel). ROBERT LACOUR-GAYET 482
The Pursuit of Robert Emmet. (Helen Landreth). JAMES A. REYNOLDS 483
The Concept of Empire in German Romanticism and Its Influence on the National Assembly at Frankfort, 1848-1849. (Ulrich Stephan Allers). HANS ROTHFELS 485
Seeds of Liberty. The Genesis of the American Mind. (Max Savelle). AARON I. ABELL 486
The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development. (Alfred H. Kelly and Winfred A. Harbison). SISTER MARIE CAROLYN KLINKHAMER 487
American Dreams. A Study of American Utopias. (Vernon Louis Parrington, Jr.). PATRICK HENRY AHERN 489
Gettysburg. (Earl Schenck Miers and Richard A. Brown). J. WALTER COLEMAN 490

V.
194

The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXIV JANUARY, 1949 No. 4

BRITISH PUBLIC OPINION AND THE KULTURKAMPF IN GERMANY, 1871-1875

By

Francis A. Arlinghaus*

The three decades after 1870 saw in Europe a wave of "international anti-clericalism." To many doctrinaire liberals, belief in the liberty of the individual, in freedom of thought, of speech and of the press, in religious toleration was coupled with a "belief in the supreme menace of ecclesiastical authority, especially that of the Catholic Church" as the "peculiarly intransigent foe of individual liberty."[1] Thus the heyday of liberalism was also the heyday of anti-clericalism.

The Kulturkampf which raged in Germany during the 1870's was the first of the more violent struggles between the Liberal State and the Catholic Church on the continent of Europe. It raised questions for anti-clericals as well as for Catholics. The early 1870's in England were a period in which British opinion was still violently agitated by the reverberations of the *Syllabus of Errors,* the Vatican Council, and the promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility. This essay is an effort to follow the currents of international anti-clericalism in the English journals and periodicals as they viewed the development of a contest between Church and State in a continental nation with which England was traditionally sympathetic. It is an attempt to show how the disciples of the creed of liberalism reacted to the practice of "illiberalism" when the target was an organization regarded by the lib-

*This article was read in an abbreviated form as the presidential address before the American Catholic Historical Association, Washington, December 30, 1948. Mr. Arlinghaus is professor of history in the University of Detroit.

[1] Carlton J. H. Hayes, *A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900* (New York, 1941), pp. 87, 48.

erals as itself the apotheosis of "illiberalism." It is intended to examine the assumption, widely held, that the English public because it was generally anti-papal and anti-infallibilist was also, automatically and unreflectingly, pro-German, pro-Bismarckian, and anti-Catholic on the issues of the Kulturkampf in Germany.

At the beginning of the contest in Germany the British press and periodicals were still in the mood that had been engendered by the Vatican Council and the promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility.[2] The "new" Catholic Church and an infallible pope were regarded as a political menace, with pretensions to civil power, and an intellectual threat to the pillars of "liberal society," embodying the kind of opposition which had been set forth in the *Syllabus of Errors*. The first reaction in the English press to the struggle in Germany between State and Church was one of sympathy for the State because it was attacking, in the Catholic Church, the great modern foe of individual liberty. The London *Times* endorsed the Bismarckian charge that the Church and the Papacy were trying to unite the Catholic powers of Europe in a plot to overthrow the new German Empire whose creation had wiped out the last hope of the restoration of the temporal sovereignty.[3] It conceived the "one great object" of the Vatican to be "the destruction of the Protestant ascendancy in Europe as represented by the new Emperor of Germany."[4] To accomplish this, the *Times* saw the Vatican now striving to bring about a French-Italian war on Germany,[5] now seeking an alliance of a clerical France with the Catholics of Germany to defeat both the Italian kingdom, which had destroyed the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, and the new Protestant German Empire, the creation of which had wiped out the last hope of its restoration.[6] And to achieve its purpose the Vatican was willing, in the mind of the *Times*,

[2] To avoid any charge of basing this essay on pro-Catholic sources, papers and periodicals like the *Tablet, Month, Mind,* and the *Dublin Review* have been barred. A deliberate effort has been made also to exclude those items in which the chief topic of discussion was the Vatican Council or the dogma of papal infallibility (worthy of separate studies in themselves) unless those subjects found their way into articles dealing primarily with the religious struggle in Germany.

[3] London *Times,* March 27, 1872; May 20, 1872; June 8, 1872; June 18, 1872.

[4] *Ibid.,* June 18, 1872.

[5] *Ibid.,* July 12, 1872; October 7, 1872.

[6] *Ibid.,* March 27, 1872; May 20, 1872; September 7, 1872.

. . . . to sacrifice the dearest interests of Germany, the credit of the Roman Catholic religion in the eyes of the world. . . . The enterprise is so desperate and so incompatible with the character of a Christian Church that men have been slow to believe in its possibility. . . . But of its reality there can, we fear, be no doubt.[7]

Yet, though "the army of the conspirators is large, its fanatacism desperate and its craft unquestionable," [8] the *Times* considered the defeat of the clerical plot inevitable "as long as Bismarck holds his ground firmly in Germany." [9]

This charge of an "ultramontane plot" against the unity of the new German Empire found credence also in the periodicals. The *Westminster Review* for April, 1872, denounced the Center Party as "the party which would fain subordinate the magistrate to the priest, the nobles to the Bishop, the King or Kaiser to the Pope." [10] And a writer in the *Contemporary Review* felt Bismarck's aim to be

. . . . to rouse the national spirit against ultramontane disloyalty and thus to render it impossible for the clergy of the Catholic Church to aid plotters in their designs against the Fatherland.[11]

The press reaction to individual incidents and to specific bits of legislation during the Kulturkampf was, for some time, conditioned by this general assumption of an ultramontane plot. The abolition of the Roman Catholic section of the Ministry of Worship, in July, 1871, went virtually unremarked in England. The "Pulpit Paragraph," however, and the Prussian school supervision bill evoked some comment.[12] The *Times* doubted whether the Pulpit Paragraph "defines

[7] *Ibid.*, March 27, 1872.

[8] London *Times*, June 18, 1872.

[9] *Ibid.*, September 7, 1872.

[10] "The Political Reconstruction of Germany," *Westminister Review*, CXLVIII (April, 1872), 164.

[11] John Gibb, "Bismarck and the Ultramontanes," *Contemporary Review*, XX (July, 1872), 182-183.

[12] The Pulpit Paragraph (*Kanzelparagraf*), introduced into the Imperial Reichstag on November 19, 1871, and passed December 10, provided a term of two years imprisonment for any clergyman who, in the pulpit, engaged in "political agitation" or used "political invectives." Because of the elasticity of interpretation given to its terms, it is often called the "India rubber paragraph." Cf. William H. Dawson, *The German Empire, 1867-1914, and the Unity Movement* (2 volumes, New York, 1919), I, 429-430; *Annual Register, 1871* (London), p. 237. The school supervision bill, applicable only in Prussia, was passed in

the nature of the offence with sufficient precision." [13] But in line with its general thesis, it saw both laws as defensive measures against the "reckless conspiracy" of the Vatican to use the Catholic Poles and Alsace-Lorrainers within the Empire and "jealous or vindictive states without" to "avenge France, dismember Germany and Italy and restore the Pope's sovereignty," a conspiracy spread chiefly by "the Pulpit and the Schoolmaster's desk." [14]

These early features of the struggle in Germany found little echo in the English periodicals at this time although they were to be discussed freely later after the Falk Laws and their enforcement had produced in England a reconsideration of the whole Kulturkampf.[15] The Jesuit Law of June, 1872, however, produced general and violent discussion in both press and periodicals.[16] The *Times*, unlike some of the periodicals, felt that the German legislation was directed against the Jesuits, not as theologians,[17] but as "the most zealous and active instruments of a power that hates German unity and hopes to destroy it" [18] and the "principal agents for restoring the Pope's temporal power, breaking Germany once more into fragments and aiding France

---

January, 1872, only after the strong opposition of the conservatives in the Prussian upper house had been overcome by a threat to create new peers. It placed the supervision of all educational institutions private and public directly under the State, and all school inspectors were made "servants of the State and in no way responsible to the different religious organizations." *Annual Register, 1872,* p. 225. Aimed chiefly at the Polish districts of Silesia and West Prussia, its enforcement was mainly confined to those districts. Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 433-434.

[13] London *Times,* November 30, 1871.

[14] *Ibid.*, March 13, March 16, 1872.

[15] Cf. below, pp. 15 ff.

[16] The Jesuit Law (*Jesuitengesetz*) abolished all Jesuit establishments in Germany, and gave the local administrative authorities in each German state the right of assigning them localities where alone they might live—which amounted to the same as expulsion. All non-German members of the Society were to be expelled forthwith. The ban might also be extended to "other orders and religious societies connected with the Jesuits," the government to determine which these societies were. *Annual Register, 1872,* pp. 241-242. Since the Federal Council interpreted the law to exclude Jesuits from all ministry in either church or school, most of the Society left Germany altogether.

[17] For an example of an article in a periodical, on the theology of the Jesuits, cf. "The Doctrines of the Jesuits," *Quarterly Review,* CXXXVIII (January, 1875). 57-106.

[18] London *Times,* July 12, 1872.

in her threatened war of revenge."[19] The Jesuits, the "Praetorian guard of the Catholic and anti-German forces of Europe," were seen as "more Austrian than Vienna, more French than Versailles, and more Roman than the Vatican." The *Times,* although sure that no such laws were desirable in England, offered to the German government and people the "sympathy of all friends of intellectual, moral and spiritual freedom" to accompany them "on their certain victory." The meeting of the Catholic Union of Great Britain on July 15, 1872, to protest against the Jesuit Law in Germany, exasperated the *Times,* but its diatribes were still directed against the "political activity" of the Society.

> . . . the British people are not very hard hearted or wholly without fairness or utterly irreligious; yet the Roman Catholics will not find it easy to enlist their sympathies on behalf of the Jesuits . . . 'wherever the Jesuits pass, they leave a ruin behind' is a saying ascribed to one of the Pope's ablest advisers. Their mode of operation does not answer anywhere in the long run; it always breaks down; but nevertheless it is a social and political mischief. It produces distrust, confusion and disturbance to the public peace. . . . Bismarck wishes to abate a very great nuisance, the nuisance of an unscrupulous conspiracy bent on dissolving society in order to accomplish certain impossible ends of its own. . . .[20]

Not all the British sheets were so moderate. The weekly *Guardian* shifted its ground on the Jesuit question. In October, 1871, when the first demand was made in the German Reichstag that the power of the state be invoked to expel the Jesuits from Germany, the *Guardian* found the demand hard to square with its ideas of religious toleration:

> . . . what is the difference between this language and the grounds on which the Inquisition purged Spain of heresy and the Paris Commune proscribed religion? If the Jesuits break the law, the law in Germany is probably strong enough to keep them in their place. But to make a crusade against them . . . and to call in the power of the state against religious rivals . . . is a bad omen for that religious freedom which is also the cause of christian truth.[21]

In May, 1872, while hastily disclaiming any particular affection for the Jesuits, the *Guardian* said flatly that the arguments in favor of the Jesuit Law

[19] *Ibid.,* May 22, 1872.

[20] *Ibid.,* July 18, 1872.

[21] "The Old Catholic Movement in Germany," *The Guardian* (London), October 4, 1871, p. 1158.

. . . do not leave us with any desire to place our own liberties at the mercy of a German Liberal. . . . When persons professing to be champions of liberty declare that opinions which they do not like or societies based on those opinions should be suppressed by law because without such suppression they would succeed too well . . . it appears to us that such persons cannot understand the nature of either liberty or christianity.[22]

Yet, after the passage of the Jesuit Law and the meeting of the Catholic Union the *Guardian* was apparently swept along by the current of anti-Jesuitism:

A Jesuit is a unique object of nearly universal dislike and especially on account of the mystery in which the Society chooses to envelop its proceedings. . . . They profess to delight in being detested and to glory in the hatred of all men as being proof of the favor of their Divine Master. . . . No reasonable onlooker can regard the expulsion of the Jesuits with the same feelings with which he would see every other religious order . . . ejected from their houses. . . . A Jesuit church or college is necessarily so evil a thing that it is easy enough to sympathize with Bismarck in his resolution to root out Jesuitism at all costs. . . . And if ever any society existed which brought its own misfortunes on its own head by its arrogance and exclusiveness, that body is certainly the society miscalled the Society of Jesus.

The *Guardian* was fearful that, in enforcing the legislation, the German government might fail to

. . . distinguish between the Jesuits and other male orders in general and still more emphatically between Jesuits and societies of women whose lives are devoted to works of practical charity. . . . In the case of schools and hospitals and other religious institutions, the social and religious influence of a community of intelligent nuns—and it is a mistake to suppose that no nuns are intelligent—may more than counterbalance the mischief of the superstition which they mix with their theological thinking.[23]

The *Guardian* was, nevertheless, skeptical of the possibility of enforcing the Jesuit Law, and it even wondered whether Bismarck's severity toward the Jesuits might not prove, in the long run, a blunder comparable to the notorious Durham Letter of Lord John Russell.

At any rate, the *Guardian* felt the problem one for Bismarck in which Britons should not meddle. It commented on the action of a

[22] *The Guardian*, May 29, 1872, p. 708.

[23] "Anglo Roman Sympathy with the Jesuits," *The Guardian*, July 24, 1872, p. 949.

number of prominent English ecclesiastics and noblemen who had signed and sent to Bismarck the Kinnaird Memorial, approving the expulsion of the Jesuits and denouncing ultramontanism: [24]

> 'They who in quarrels interpose
> Will often wipe a bloody nose'.
> If so, fifty seven pocket handkerchiefs will be wanted by fifty seven gentlemen who have signed an address to Prince Bismarck. . . . The position that the claim to theological infallibility is a matter calling for the interposition of the civil authority should not have been put forward by persons claiming (as these gentlemen do) to speak 'as citizens of a country long blessed with civil and religious liberty'.[25]

A writer in the *Contemporary Review,* in December, 1872, echoed the *Guardian* in calling the Bismarckian expulsion of the Jesuits a "grievous mistake" comparable to the Durham Letter, because it had rekindled the loyalty of the priests and bishops of Germany to the Jesuits:

> They are again respected as sufferers in the cause of christian truth and justified in their ancient boast that whenever Catholicism is attacked, they themselves are made the first victims of its enemies. . . . Every wise man will, according to my judgment, do best by letting the Jesuits alone. The only possible way of lessening their influence on the whole Catholic body is to leave them to the enjoyment of that unpopularity which is sure to accompany the Society of Jesus as long as it exists.[26]

Other writers in the periodicals were equally kind to the Jesuits. An article in the *Edinburgh Review* accused them in Germany, in the eighteenth century, of seeking

[24] The signers included the Marquis of Cholmondeley, Lord Lawrence, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Arthur Kinnaird (whose name was given to it), the Archbishop of Armagh, the Bishops of Worcester and Ripon, the Moderators of the Established Church of Scotland, of the English and Irish Presbyterian Churches, the President and Secretary of the Wesleyan Conference. A digest is in Winifred Taffs, *Ambassador to Bismarck: Lord Odo Russell, First Baron Ampthill,* (London, 1938), p. 16.

[25] "An Address to Prince Bismarck," *The Guardian,* September 18, 1872, p. 1168.

[26] J. M. Capes, "The Jesuits in England," *Contemporary Review,* XXI (December, 1872), 36-38. The author of this article was a Catholic priest. But it is included in this paper since the point of view is not unduly favorable to the Jesuits.

. . . to establish a Catholicism saturated with fanatical obedience to a Papal Caliph and . . . to insure the permanence of that sentiment by subjecting the mind to stagnation or by crippling the faculties of the intellect just as a miserable system of baby farming is calculated to rear lymphatic children that can never grow into vigorous beings.[27]

The *British Quarterly Review* displayed a firm grasp of the obvious, declaring that

. . . the Jesuits have worked with consummate sagacity . . . to use every means by which to mold and indoctrinate the young. The old die and quickly give place to their successors. The Jesuit always looks forward to the future as rapidly rising out of the Present.

It added, not too accurately:

Almost all clerical seminaries have been placed under their control. . . . The convent schools for the daughters of the wealthy and the schools established by the Sisters of Mercy for the poorer classes have likewise been put under their direction . . . in every educational institution. . . . Jesuit influence has been made to predominate—for everywhere the mighty power of the Pope has seconded their efforts.[28]

Fraser's Magazine (edited by James Anthony Froude) called the Jesuits "the missionaries of sedition" whose aim it was "to stab the liberties of men and disturb the repose of states," but it took solace in the

. . . concurrent testimony of history that every political or revolutionary movement conceived or conducted by the Jesuits has invariably proved a signal failure attended with disastrous consequences to its dupes.[29]

To the *Quarterly Review,* the Jesuits were the advocates of "Papal absolutism and the struggle against Protestantism." It said flatly that "wherever they appear, religious peace is at an end." [30]

From September, 1874, to January, 1875, Robert Morier, British chargé d'affaires at Munich, published four articles, written anony-

[27] "The Religious Movement in Germany," *Edinburgh Review,* CXXXVII (April, 1873), 535.

[28] "Catholicism and Papal Infallibility," *British Quarterly Review,* LVIII (July, 1873), 65-67.

[29] "The Jesuits and their Expulsion from Germany," *Fraser's Magazine,* LXXXVII (May, 1873), 631, 646.

[30] "The War between Prussia and Rome," *Quarterly Review,* CXXXVI (April, 1874), 317.

mously, in *Macmillan's Magazine,* on the struggle in Germany.[31] The fourth article in the series expressed full approval of the objects of the Jesuit Law, but found fault with the methods by which it was carried out, and expressed doubt of its efficacy.

> . . . we altogether doubt whether, practically, any good can be got out of its application. Police surveillance will go a very little way in rendering Jesuits innocuous; and the notion of teasing them into inactivity is simply ludicrous.[32]

By and large, British press and periodical writers approved the Jesuit Law, although here and there some question was raised as to its effectiveness. It was almost a summary of the English attitude which one writer gave in the *Quarterly Review*:

> In the instinctive sentiment of the Civil Power that is being confronted by an organization bristling with menacing sentiments is to be found the key to the state of public feeling—most marked in Germany, but unmistakably running along the whole line of modern governments—which looks on the new Constitution of the Latin Church with uneasiness and singles out the Society of Jesus as the Praetorian guard of a dangerous ecclesiastical Caesarism.[33]

The Jesuit Law was the issue in the German struggle in which the British writers came closest to a single viewpoint. The next peak in British opinion came with the introduction into the Prussian Diet of the Falk Laws, the first in November, 1872, the other three in

[31] "Prussia and the Vatican—I—The Settlement of the Peace of Westphalia," *Macmillan's Magazine,* XXX (September, 1874), 464-472; II—"The Relations between Church and State in Prussia to 1850," *ibid.,* XXX (October, 1874), 559-566; III—"From 1850 to the Vatican Council," *ibid.,* XXXI (November, 1874), 72-86; IV—"The Prussian and German Legislation to which the Vatican Decrees Gave Rise," *ibid.,* XXXI (January, 1875) 261-280. The articles, as was customary in *Macmillan's,* were unsigned. But the authorship of Morier is clearly authenticated by his own correspondence with Dr. Jowett of Balliol College, Oxford; cf. Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss, *Memoirs and Letters of the Right Honorable Sir Robert Morier,* G.C.B., (2 volumes, London, 1911), II, 305-315. The articles, although by no means uncritical of Bismarck, were, in the main, critical of the attitude of the Catholic Church and the German bishops. Morier conducted, still anomymously, a running controversy, on the articles, with Archbishop Manning, in *Macmillan's Magazine* from November, 1874, to February, 1875.

[32] *Loc. cit.,* January, 1875, p. 269.

[33] "The Doctrines of the Jesuits," *Quarterly Review,* CXXXVIII (January, 1875), 106.

January, 1873.[34] No other single feature of the Kulturkampf provoked either so much or such strikingly divergent reaction in the British press and periodicals. Between the introduction and the passage of the Falk Laws, November, 1872, to May, 1873, comment was confined to the daily and weekly press, the periodicals taking up the question only much later, in 1874.

The *Spectator* was by all odds the severest and most consistent critic of Bismarck's policies. The first of the Falk Laws, the Ecclesiastical Punishments Bill, it considered

[34] The Falk Laws were named after their sponsor, the Prussian Minister of Worship. They were four in number. The Ecclesiastical Punishments Bill, introduced in November, 1872, restricted the infliction of excommunication to strictly clerical offenses, forbidding its use in matters arising out of civil conduct, and restricting also certain types of punishment of clergymen. The other three were introduced in January, 1873. The Law on the Training and Education of the Clergy limited candidates for the ministry or priesthood in any church, Protestant or Catholic, to native Germans who had passed the examinations in a German gymnasium, studied theology at least three years in a German university or a seminary approved by the Minister of Worship, and passed a public government examination giving evidence of "scientific culture" in history, philosophy, and German literature. Every new appointment of a minister or priest was to be submitted to the Ober-präsident of the province who might veto it on any one of three grounds: 1) that the candidate lacked the qualifications required by law; 2) that he had undergone a criminal sentence; 3) that there existed grounds for the assumption that he *might* oppose the laws of the State or disturb the public peace. Any appointment made contrary to this law was subject to fine and imprisonment. New seminaries for boys were forbidden, and all existing seminaries were placed under government supervision and might under certain conditions be closed. The Law Concerning the Disciplinary Power of Churches provided for appeals from ecclesiastical disciplinary sentences to the Royal Court of Ecclesiastical Affairs, and at the same time forbade any ecclesiastical court outside Germany to exercise disciplinary power over Prussian clergy; the civil officials might, even without the wishes of the clergyman concerned, carry a case to the Royal Court of Ecclesiastical Affairs, whose decisions were not bound by positive law but only by the "free conviction" of its members. The Law Concerning Secession from a Church prescribed the necessary formalities for withdrawing from a religious community or church. These laws, applicable only in Prussia, but to all denominations, Catholic or Protestant, were all passed in May, 1873, and are sometimes called the May Laws (*Maigesetze*). This summary is based on Spahn, "Kulturkampf" in *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* VIII, 707-708; *Annual Register, 1873,* pp. 181 ff.; Dawson, *op. cit.,* I, 439; and "Prince Bismarck and the Church of Rome," *Edinburgh Review,* CXXXIX (April, 1874), 377-382. The full text of the laws, in English, is in John Brown Paton, "What Are the Falk Laws?" *Fortnightly Review,* XXI (June, 1874), 674-694.

. . . a measure of feeble persecution which can hardly be either good statesmanship, or good morality . . . the so called 'Liberals' of Prussia seem to have lost all confidence in the power of light to fight Roman Catholic authoritarianism. . . . They seem to believe in the Lord of Hosts as distinguished from the Spirit of Truth and to have made up their minds that only the baton of the policemen and the sword of the soldier are strong enough to fight against the mitre of the Bishop and the soutane of the priest. But they will fail, for Liberalism cannot afford to exchange arms with its enemies and to persecute in the name of progress.[35]

When Pius IX, in December, 1872, condemned the "persecutions of the church in the German Empire", the *Spectator* felt that the papal utterances were given an added sting by the dogma of papal infallibility, but it showed little sympathy with the German protests:

The Germans are certainly in a wonderfully hysterical state. They inaugurate a national campaign against the Roman Church and the Jesuits with a great flourish of trumpets and universal joy at the greatness of the undertaking and then they take great offence because the Pope scolds them in angry Latin and calls it shameless in their leaders to say that what they have done does not hurt the Church in Germany.[36]

That was the general position of the *Spectator*. It was anti-papal and anti-infallibilist, but also anti-Bismarckian because it regarded the whole Kulturkampf as "illiberal."

Liberalism in Prince Bismarck's mouth means war with the Catholic Church and a war of a kind which we would call Orangeism and not Liberalism. . . . we decline to regard it as a policy of Liberalism to punish by persecution even bigoted churches and reactionary creeds.[37]

It deprecated the support of the proposed legislation by Prussian liberals as "the most astounding phenomenon of modern Liberalism" and as indicating that

. . . modern thought in Prussia values itself so little and its hatred of the Roman Church so much that it will cheerfully commit suicide in order to ensure . . . the death of its antagonist.[38]

We trust that English and Scottish Non-conformists will carefully study

[35] "The New Law of Persecution in Prussia," *The Spectator,* November 30, 1872, pp. 1513-1515.

[36] "The Pope's New Position," *The Spectator,* January 4, 1873, p. 4.

[37] *The Spectator,* March 15, 1873, p. 327.

[38] *Ibid.,* January 25, 1873, p. 98.

the astounding provisions of the new religious legislation of Prussia. . . . If adopted in this country. . . . It would be a system far more fatal to religious equality and religious liberty than any established church which England has known since the Revolution of 1688.[39]

It remarked sarcastically, when *Germania,* the organ of the Center Party, was prosecuted for publishing a translation of the *Spectator's* article of November 30, 1872, on the first Falk Law:

This then is a Liberal government in a very emphatic sense indeed—so Liberal that it will not allow the Liberalism of its own measures to be temperately challenged by Liberals even on the ground of principles which have been accepted as axiomatically liberal from time immemorial. . . .[40]

Another weekly, the *Economist,* also entered a *caveat,* while the Falk Laws were being debated.

. . . the German 'Liberals' . . . want, they say, to destroy the 'Pfaffenthums', Protestant as well as Catholic, and they regard the state as the only power strong enough to bit and bridle it and render it virtually impotent. . . . We do not think this kind of legislation wholesome. We have no sympathy whatever with the ambitious attempts of the Church of Rome to interfere in political matters and think that any punishments which priests may incur for disobeying the ordinary civil law of the realm are just punishments. But to prevent such measures as these by giving the state practically a veto on the spontaneous life of the moral and religious teachers of the nation is, in our minds, to apply a remedy far more mischievous than the disease.[41]

The *Times,* during this period of incubation of the Falk Laws, took the general line that the proposed legislation, though perhaps a bit strong in some details and not of the kind to recommend itself in England, was in harmony with "the old German and the old English principles of national authority," and necessary in Germany, where the Catholic clergy formed "a class of men who now bring division and danger into the state." [42]

Germany is meeting Rome on her own ground. . . . Had the Syllabus or the decrees of the Vatican Council been simply translated into the language

[39] "The New Prussian State Religion," *The Spectator,* January 25, 1873, pp. 100-101.

[40] *The Spectator,* March 22, 1873, p. 362.

[41] "The Prussian State Church," *The Economist,* February 22, 1873, pp. 221-222.

[42] *The Times,* March 11, 1873; May 21, 1873.

of the Civil Power . . . we should have the substance of the new German measures.[43]

With the passage of the Falk Laws in May, 1873, and their enforcement through 1873, 1874, and 1875, the British writers began to split in their opinions. Practically all of them continue to be anti-papal, and some of them are by the same token pro-Bismarckian. But most of them draw a distinction between the abstract aim of the Kulturkampf and the method of enforcement of the Falk Laws. And some object even to the theory of the Falk legislation as destructive of "liberal ideas."

The exchange of letters between Pius IX and Emperor William I on the ecclesiastical legislation in Germany and Prussia [44] caused in the *Times* a sharp flare up of anti-papalism and fear that England herself might have to engage in a campaign against Catholicism:

. . . The Rome which molests Germany and menaces its disruption . . . is the same Rome which in these Isles fraternizes with every form of sedition and affiliates every movement against the peace and union of the realm. . . . If Germany feels the fears confessed by the powerful Emperor . . . this country may also condescend to think that there is reason for apprehension. It is certain that the Powers of Europe will have to act together against a common foe. . . . Insular as we are, we are too close to the neighboring continent not to have at least our share of the common danger.[45]

Yet, beginning the very next day, the *Times* began to modify its position, and through the balance of 1873 and early 1874, it seemed

[43] *Ibid.*, April 19, 1873.

[44] Pius IX, August 7, 1873, had addressed a letter to William I, suggesting that the ecclesiastical laws might not really meet with the emperor's approval, and that William might act to clear up the difficulties. The Pope said he might speak boldly to the emperor, although the latter was not a Catholic, because all peoples were entrusted to his care, Protestants and Catholics alike. The emperor replied on September 3, assuring the Pope that the legislation had his full approval, and accusing the Catholics of Germany of having begun the whole struggle by maintaining a political party whose purpose was defiance of the laws of the State and support of foreign intrigues and plots against the unity of the empire. William, therefore, suggested that the Pope restrain the Catholics of Germany, if the conflict were to be resolved. The texts of the letters are in the strongly anti-papal volume edited in 1874 by the Reverend George R. Badenoch, *Ultramontanism. England's Sympathy with Germany and Germany's Response* (London, 1874), pp. 18-22.

[45] *The Times,* October 16, 1873.

to face both ways. It was still anti-papal and hence sympathetic to Bismarckian policy in general, but it began to question the wisdom of its methods and to be skeptical of its chances of success:

> The conflict is likely to be serious. The Church's power is impalpable and is therefore not easy to be dealt with. . . . We hope at least that the limits of the struggle may be defined and that neutrals may not be dragged in against their will. . . . Our interests are the same everywhere. We wish for peace and good government for our neighbors not for their sakes only but for our own. If peace, therefore, is interrupted and order threatened in Germany, we cannot regard it with indifference, though happily it is not our business to question the wisdom of the somewhat high handed policy which has compelled the present issue.[46]
>
> We in England can venture to let things pretty well alone and to trust English common sense to baffle the common enemy. We should have been glad if the same course had been found possible in Germany; but if not, the German government will command sympathy in all measures of necessary rigor and restraint. It is no religious persecution. . . .[47]

At first it merely questioned the expediency of the Prussian ecclesiastical legislation without impugning its justifiability:

> . . . the Prussians are simply asserting a right which it is the pride of Englishmen to have established three centuries ago. . . . The obvious aim of the King and his advisers is to render the Catholic Church in Prussia national instead of Roman in its character and administration . . . whether such decrees violate the spiritual liberties of the Church, the answer is not so simple. . . . When a reaction comes against undue prerogative, it is apt to go somewhat too far and we do not undertake to defend the Falk Laws in detail. . . . We shall rejoice if the Prussians are successful . . . in solving one of the most difficult problems of modern statesmanship. But we cannot feel that they have adequately measured their strength for the occasion. That it is a justifiable course appears to us unquestionable, but it is a different inquiry whether it is equally expedient.[48]

Soon even that criticism appeared. In one of its periodic journalistic controversies with Archbishop Manning, in December, 1873,[49] the *Times* challenged Manning's statement that the Falk Laws were "ex post facto" legislation, but, at the same time, it added that

[46] *Ibid.*, October 17, 1873.
[47] *Ibid.*, October 21, 1873.
[48] *ibid.*
[49] *Ibid.*, December 9-11, 1873.

. . . the coercion by force of a clergy conscientiously and irrevocably pledged to resistance is not justifiable and is still less likely to prove possible.[50]

The position of the *Times,* in December, 1873, was, in fact, reminiscent of that peasant dance of Echternach, three leaps forward and two backward. It was careful to say that "We advance no plea for the Vatican," but it could also say that

. . . it is merely a question of time when the whole existing organization of the Roman Catholic Church in Prussia will be forcibly suspended . . . it seems to us that at the present moment it is the Prussian government which is precipitating a complete and irreparable rupture.[51]

It could say one week, in another of its logomachies with Manning:

If past victories be the true augury of the future, we need not be disturbed at the prospect. . . . The history of Roman Catholicism is, at least for these three hundred years of which Archbishop Manning speaks, a history of continual though often gradual defeat, and the German nation which at the Reformation inflicted on Rome the most deadly blow she ever received is now preparing to complete the victory. . . .[52]

Yet, the next week, it asserted that

The reason why we do not actively join the Germans in their present movement is that we doubt the expediency and perhaps the justice of some of the means to which their government is having recourse in its battle with Rome. It is not perhaps for us to condemn another country for feeling itself compelled to use in this nineteenth century weapons with which we fought our battle three hundred years ago. But neither is it our duty to approve measures of coercion that we certainly should not now adopt.[53]

During the fall of 1873, some English Protestants (principally members of the Carlton Club, the Reform Club, and the National Club) formed a committee for the purpose of holding meetings to mobilize public opinion against the "new Catholic Church of the Vatican Council and Infallibility," and to express sympathy for William I and Bismarck in the Kulturkampf. A meeting was scheduled for January 27, 1874, and Lord John Russell accepted an invitation to preside. Two meetings were, in fact, held, one in the morning in St. James

[50] *Ibid.,* December 11, 1873.
[51] *Ibid.,* December 19, 1873.
[52] *Ibid.,* December 24, 1873.
[53] *Ibid.,* January 1, 1874.

Hall, the other in the evening in Exeter Hall.[54] Lord John Russell was prevented from attending by a cold. But the meetings, after speeches strongly anti-papal, anti-Jesuit, and anti-Catholic [55], drew up resolutions of sympathy for the cause of the German government, and forwarded them to Emperor William.

The *Times* expressed itself strongly in opposition to the "Protestant" and "No Popery" tone of the St. James Hall meeting, and cautioned the German government against interpreting the meetings as really representative of English opinion:

> . . . A new war of creeds such as the meeting of yesterday tends to provoke would be the greatest of all disasters for the new German Empire. . . . The German government is on perfectly safe ground so long as it confines itself to asserting the impartial supremacy of the State. If it should be led beyond this into anything like a crusade against a particular creed, it would be abandoning its true province and would certainly fail to command general sympathy in this country.[56]

The Catholics of England, as a counter measure to the Protestant meetings, held one of their own on February 6, 1874, and drew up resolutions protesting the imprisonment of Archbishop Ledochowski. The *Times* commented:

> [Archbishop Ledochowski] must be assumed to be acting according to his conscience in a matter of religion; and it is a fixed principle with us that to coerce a man to act against his conscience in matters of religion is wrong. . . . Nor is it less difficult for us to understand what Prince Bismarck hopes to accomplish by this severity. . . . Fines and imprisonment are light matters to a man who thinks that he is playing the role of a martyr. . . . The meeting . . . was certainly right in saying that [this policy] is not one which should be adopted in England.[57]

Two months later, on occasion of the arrest of the Bishops of Cologne and of Treves, the *Times* found the "vehemence of the German

[54] Verbatim reports of the two meetings are found in Badenoch, *Ultramontanism*, pp. 23-118; 119-164.

[55] A letter was read at the St. James Hall meeting from Dr. Stanley, the Dean of Westminster, who was at the time on the continent, approving the official efforts of the German government to advance the cause of the "Old Catholics" *within* the Catholic Church; Badenoch, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-33.

[56] *The Times*, January 28, 1874. For the more violently disapproving attitude of other journals, cf. *The Spectator*, January 27, 1874, and *The Guardian*, February 4, 1874, quoted below.

[57] *The Times*, February 7, 1874.

government . . . more and more inexplicable" and added, in language that was far different from that of its own leaders of 1871 and 1872:

> . . . we cannot clearly make out what these Roman Catholic ecclesiastics have actually done. . . . It is said that the political dispositions and teaching of the church are dangerous to the state and that the priest is the foe of German unity. But what overt act has been committed? What proof is there of any anti-national design having actually been formed? . . . The government now has four Romish bishops in prison and is committed to a struggle of which it is impossible to see the end. The necessity for embarking on such an enterprise is not apparent to English eyes.[58]

Finally, in May, 1874, when the bill authorizing the expulsion of recalcitrant bishops and the sequestration of their property was passed in the Prussian Diet,[59] the *Times* said:

> . . . it is impossible not to be struck by the multiplication of laws on this subject. . . . Each successive law seems to require another to enforce it or complete it . . . this fact alone suggests some misgivings as to the wisdom of the course. . . . There are many subjects with which interference is in the nature of things interminable. . . . This is eminently true in matters of religion when once a strong feeling in favor of freedom of conscience has been aroused. . . . It can only be said of this kind of legislation that it is entirely beyond our experience.[60]

The *Times* had not suddenly gained sympathy for the Vatican (as it had been careful to point out); but it had lost sympathy for the Falk Laws and the methods of Bismarck.

The periodicals furnished more support for the Falk legislation than the *Times*, and some of them, at least, made no distinction between the aims of the Bismarckian policy and its methods. Two or three writers early in 1874 appeared to find the Falk Laws and their vigorous enforcement proper either out of sheer malice against

[58] *The Times*, April 8, 1874. It is instructive to compare this article with the *Times*' endorsement of charges of a Catholic conspiracy against the unity of the German Empire above: November 30, 1871, March 27, May 20, June 8, June 18, September 7, October 7, 1872.

[59] The Priests-Expulsion Law was the third of the Supplementary Ecclesiastical Laws of 1874, designed to supply deficiencies in the original Falk Laws of 1873. The other two, passed in March, 1874, dealt with the administration of vacated parishes and dioceses whose priests or bishops had been removed by the government. *Annual Register, 1874*, pp. 213-214.

[60] *The Times*, May 27, 1874.

Catholicism or out of a militant Protestantism. One writer derived satisfaction out of the imprisonment of Archbishop Ledochowski in that, despite the protests of English Catholics and the freely expressed sympathy of people from all over Europe,

> . . . the age of miracles is past, the race of martyrs is no more and the Count Archbishop lies within the prison gates.[61]

In similar vein, *Fraser's Magazine* saw the issue simply as one of obedience to laws voted by a freely elected parliament.

> Count Ledochowski is not lying in the gaol of Ostrowo on account of his belief in this or that article of his creed but on account of his violations of certain clauses in the Statute Book. . . . It is not a question of whether this Prussian legislation is either good or bad or indifferent taken by itself. . . . It is rather—are Germans masters in their own house or not?[62]

Another writer, a month later, enlisted the sympathies of the Protestants of England on the side of Bismarck:

> . . . it is perfectly plain that the Falk Laws do not prevent a single Catholic in Prussia from fulfilling his religious duties as strictly as his heart may desire. . . . It is beginning to be more and more generally understood that what is going on in Prussia is a contest of law against rebellion, a contest of freedom against fanatacism. . . . Nor let us think that England can remain a passive or a supercilious spectator of the conflict. . . . The saturnine spirit which despises earnestness may sneer at our Protestant sympathy with Germany and the undiscriminating adherents of a formula may raise timid questionings about universal toleration; but the 'unerring instinct' of the English people sympathises as warmly in the nineteenth century as in the sixteenth and seventeenth with the cause of religious liberty in Germany.[63]

These articles, in a sense, sidestepped a direct judgment on the Falk Laws. Others came to immediate grips with them. The fourth article in the Morier series in *Macmillan's Magazine*[64] passed in judgment the whole Kulturkampf and individual items of legislation

[61] W. Hepworth Dixon, "Prince Bismarck and Pio Nono," *The Gentleman's Magazine,* (New Series) XII (March, 1874), 290.

[62] "Germany and the Papacy," *Fraser's Magazine,* LXXXIX (April, 1874), 410-411; 417-418.

[63] "The War Between Prussia and Rome," *Quarterly Review,* CXXXVI (April, 1874) 327-332.

[64] Cf. above, footnote 31.

with particular stress on the Falk Laws. Its language is vivid and picturesque, and its conclusions mixed. The law forbidding the use of excommunication in cases involving political or non-religious offenses, the writer believed fully justified:

> To allow a body organized like the Roman Church to use such a weapon for political purposes on the plea of liberty of conscience appears to us the mere raving of political superstition. If it is right to make piqueting an indictable offense, it is a thousand times more right to make intimidation of public servants and electors by excommunication an indictable offense.[65]

Morier devoted a good deal of attention to the law on the training and education of the clergy. On the clauses dealing with seminaries, his opinions were equivocal:

> . . . considering that the seminaries are not allowed to take in new inmates and must, in the natural course of things die out, the provision appears to us a very useless kind of bureaucratic *tracasserie* . . . the prima facie case against these seminaries and colleges, however, is a very strong one. It is certain that they are looked on by the Ultramontanes as the key of their position or rather the base of their operations . . . it may be plausibly argued that what Ultramontanists and Saint Ignatianists and Vaticanists affirm to be the great instruments of their power may be fairly attacked by society.[66]

Of the requirement that all candidates for the ministry spend three years in a German university, the writer could

> . . . only say that we heartily wish . . . our own Anglican, Romanist and non-Conformist pastors and masters would be compelled by 'Forster' laws to go forth to their work thus equipped.[67]

The Law on Education of the Clergy, it will be recalled, gave the government the authority to veto a candidate for ecclesiastical appointment on any one of three grounds: 1) that the candidate did not possess the qualifications required by law, e.g., in the matter of education; 2) that he had undergone a criminal sentence; 3) that facts existed which justified the assumption that he *might* oppose the

[65] "Prussia and the Vatican—IV—The Prussian and German Legislation to which the Vatican Decrees Gave Rise," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XXXI (January, 1875), 271-272.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 275-276.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

laws of the State or disturb the public peace. The first two grounds Morier felt proper, but the third

> . . . we can only describe as deplorable. . . . The vagueness, the elasticity, the utter want of tangibility in the principle laid down seems to us to be truly appalling. It reminds us of nothing so much as the lady who refused to call on her neighbor whom she did not know because she saw something about her eyes which told her she would not return the visit.[68]

The writer summed up his views on the probable results of the Falk Laws in these terms:

> . . . whilst making every allowance for the obstinacy and unreasonableness and calculated fanaticism . . . of the hierarchy . . . the campaign has been on the part of the executive authorities hopelessly mismanaged. . . . It was certain that the Curia had a demand for martyrs . . . and the greatest care should have been taken to limit the supply to a minimum. . . . By not following this precept . . . the Prussian authorities have rendered a real service to the Vatican. . . .[69]

Another critic in the *Fortnightly Review* argued that the law on the education of priests insured the "rights of the laity to an educated priesthood," and that the restrictions on excommunication protected the laity "against the tyranny of the hierarchy." The declaration of the Prussian bishops that the Falk Laws contravened the will of God and that they would obey the laws of God rather than those of men,[70] the critic answered with the assertion that Bavaria, Baden, and Wurttemberg already had similar laws, and he asked:

> Is God's will chameleonic to their view? Is it a changeful, climatic convenient thing so that what conforms with it in Bavaria is impious rebellion in Prussia and what was commendable in Prussia for one half century is damnable in the same country for the other half?

He found the Falk Laws not only "just and moderate," but "in view of the organization and growing forces of Ultramontanism," "grossly inadequate." [71]

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 277-278.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[70] In an address to the Prussian government, May 26, 1873; cf. Spahn, "Kulturkampf" in *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, VIII, 707, and Dawson, *German Empire*, I, 440.

[71] John Brown Paton, "The New Relations of Church and State in Germany," *Fortnightly Review*, XXIII (February, 1875), 184-196.

Another supporter of the Falk Laws called them the result of the alteration of the terms of Church-State relations by the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility, and hence justified, although "burdensome and oppressive" as a measure of retaliation:

> The misfortune of the German Catholics is that they cannot voluntarily accept a remedy which infallibility has already condemned [separation of Church and State]; . . . With their own hands the Vatican Bishops tied the knot and now they themselves cannot loose it. They were well warned of the consequences . . . they can count on little sympathy outside their own party. Samson may be pitied for the loss of his eyes; but he is not entitled to much commiseration if he pull down the house upon his own head.[72]

There was thus substantial approval for the Falk Laws in some English periodicals, but there was also strong disapproval.

The *Spectator* was, after the passage of the laws as before, severely critical of both the principles and the methods of enforcement, without being at all pro-clerical. In May, 1873, just at the time of the passage of the Falk Laws, the German government took action to expel from Germany the Redemptorists, the Lazarists, the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and the Congregation of the Most Holy Heart, as "connected with the Jesuits." The *Spectator* buzzed waspishly:

> . . . we have a very indistinct conception what these latter and apparently mystical orders really are, but surely the Redemptorists are about as closely connected with the Jesuits as the University of London with the Royal Artillery . . .[73]

An article in the *Contemporary Review* discussed the whole problem of liberty versus authority in Church and State relations and deprecated support of "Bismarckism" by English "liberals":

> Is the tide of liberation of thought and opinion to be reversed and to flow back once more into the narrow channels of bigotry and constraint? These are the issues raised not only by Prince Bismarck's action in Germany but by the preachers of Bismarckism in England. Their principles have been rather ironically termed the 'New Liberalism' but they are really nothing more than the most arrogant principles of despotism served up in a new dish.[74]

[72] "Ultramontanism and Civil Allegiance," *British Quarterly Review*, LXI (April, 1875), 477-478.

[73] *The Spectator*, May 17, 1873, p. 613.

[74] Edward Jenkins, "Bismarckism in England," *The Contemporary Review*, XXII (June, 1873), 108.

During the controversy between Archbishop Manning and the London *Times* in December, 1873, alluded to above, the *Spectator* commented:

> The *Times* says very truly that Archbishop Manning brings no proof that before the Falk Laws were introduced the Roman Catholic clergy were loyal to the German Empire. But how can a man be expected to bring proof of the loyalty of a class? Where loyalty exists, it is not usual to have proofs of it but only disproofs.

It went on, in terms that summed up its own idea of liberalism (and, indeed, that of many English "liberals"):

> We believe that the interference of the State is properly limited to dealing with the moral and social outcomes of creeds, not with the creeds themselves. If you won't vaccinate your child, for religious reasons; if you won't educate your child, for religious reasons; if you insist on widows burning themselves, for religious reasons; if you excite tumult and disorder, for religious reasons—the State ought to interfere and does, but not with motives and reasons, only with results, with which it is properly concerned and charged. The Tudor legislation went far beyond this. It forbade Roman Catholic ceremonials by Penal Laws just as Roman Catholics forbade Protestant worship, and both were equally wrong. It is ridiculous today to repeat the blunders of the times of the Tudors. And it is because Prussia seems to us to be repeating them in the most glaring form that we hold her recent legislation to be so utterly bad.[75]

The *Spectator* confessed itself "astonished and humiliated" by "the delight with which journals calling themselves Liberal find excuses without the ghost of a reason in them, for approving the Prussian persecution of Lutherans, and Roman Catholics,"[76] because it felt "there has been no legislation more destructive of religious liberty than the Prussian ecclesiastical legislation of the last year."[77] The *Spectator* attacked the St. James Hall gathering of January 27, 1874, both in advance of and after the meeting. It said on December 20, 1873, that by adopting the resolutions that were to be offered, the meeting

> . . . will endorse the charge deliberately made [in the letter of William I to Pius IX] that they [the German Catholics] have been guilty of treason-

---

[75] *The Spectator,* December 13, 1873, pp. 1567-1568.

[76] *Ibid.,* February 7, 1874, p. 163; October 11, 1873, p. 1262.

[77] *Ibid.,* December 20, 1873, p. 1607.

able plots against the unity of the Empire . . . that accusation having been vehemently repudiated by the accused and never supported by a particle of evidence . . . it would be more generous to incline to the belief in an innocence that has never been disproved than in a guilt that has only been asserted. . . Germany must come to England to learn what civil and religious liberty means, not we go to Germany. . . . For us to express admiration of what the Germans are now doing is much what it would be for English naval engineers to express admiration for the canoes of the South sea islanders . . .[78]

After the meeting, the *Spectator* found that "many threats were thrown out of dealing with popery in England in like manner should occasion occur" and it asked:

But does not as much occasion as there has ever been shown to be in Prussia, occur here every day? Why not therefore, put the Roman Catholic religion under state management at once?[79]

It called attention, with obvious relish, to the cartoon of the week in *Punch,* which depicted Bismarck rushing to strike at the retreating forms of mitred bishops,[80] while Lord John Russell stood, well behind the chancellor, swabbing a copiously running nose with a large kerchief and saying, "Go it, Bismarck. Pitch into 'em. I'd ha' done it myself only I've such an awfully bad cold".

Dean Stanley's letter [81] was a special target for the *Spectator* the same day:

. . . we have shown again and again that the new Falk Laws are gross invasions of those rights which in England we have won and cherish and the Dean has not advanced one single consideration to show that they are not. . . . We believe that Roman Catholicism cannot be fought by such weapons and that it is even now gaining materially thru the folly and sins of its opponents.[82]

[78] "The German Persecutions and English Sympathies," *The Spectator,* December 20, 1873, pp. 1607-1608.

[79] *The Spectator,* January 31, 1874, p. 131.

[80] *The Spectator* pointed out that the bishops were, in reality, not retreating at all, but were standing their ground very firmly.

[81] Cf. above, footnote 55.

[82] "Dean Stanley's Plea for Intolerance." *The Spectator,* January 31, 1874, pp. 134-135. The *Punch* cartoon recalls the cartoon run by the same sheet in 1851 during the "No Popery" agitation stimulated by Russell's letter to the Bishop of Durham. Russell was then shown as a naughty boy chalking "No Popery" on Cardinal Wiseman's door and running away.

The *Economist,* too, began to scoff at the "ultramontane conspiracy" charge made by Bismarck, and to decry his use of force:

. . . Prince Bismarck has, we are well aware, professed that his ecclesiastical legislation was forced on him by the opposition of Rome to the growth of the German Empire. We confess to have always regarded this assertion with a good deal of incredulity. . . . Prince Bismarck seems to be more forceful than wise. He is one of those who feel so profoundly the value of physical force as not to be able to recognize its limits. . . .[83]

Some of the *Spectator's* bitter opposition to the German policies appear in the following:

It is superfluous to add that the order for the expulsion of the Poor Clares, Little Sisters of the Poor . . . and other formidable female organizations of the Roman Church is being executed with due order and precision. . . . To be of a different mind from the state's mind, in little things or great, in marrying or in remaining celibate, in choosing your acquaintances or your newspaper—this is the intolerable crime, *Es lebe der Kulturkampf.*[84]

The *Spectator* joined the *Guardian* in decrying the support of the Bismarckian policies by some English and Scottish churchmen:

We cannot but lament when we see our English Churchmen sympathising with violently tyrannical proceedings solely because they inflict a temporary temporal injury upon the detested Pope or the still more detested Jesuits. . . . The intrusive tyranny whether of Pope or King is alike abhorrent to us and not even for the sake of the permanent exile of every Roman ecclesiastic from the whole United Kingdom could we consistently consent to the adoption of a principle which is destructive of the first elements of all personal religion.[85]

. . . this is the condition of things which Scottish and English meetings summoned to express their sympathy with Germany in its struggle with the Papacy really support—a state of things which would drive the Free Church of Scotland to fury and English dissenters to madness. It is hardly creditable to English good sense that the flutter of the Red Flag of Popery has so blinded our eyes as to render it insensible to the monstrous system we are aiding by our sympathies.[86]

[83] "Prince Bismarck's Interference in France," *The Economist,* January 24, 1874, p. 96.

[84] "A Week's Kulturkampf in Prussia," *The Spectator,* September 26, 1874, pp. 1195-1196.

[85] "The Falk Laws in Their Bearing upon the Position of the English Church," *The Guardian,* June 3, 1874, pp. 688-689.

[86] "A German Protestant on the Ecclesiastical Laws," *The Spectator,* October 17, 1874, pp. 1291-1292.

The *Spectator* and the *Guardian* were not alone in their views. Frederic Harrison, one of the leading positivist, free-thinkers in England, wrote in the *Fortnightly Review* a devastating criticism of the Falk Laws and the whole of the Bismarckian policies. As a standard of judgment, Harrison set forth three principles for free thinkers to apply to the German ecclesiastical legislation:

> The First Principle is *No State Church.* We repudiate every form of religious organization paid and directed by the government. . . . The Second Principle is *No State Interference with Opinion.* Opinion, be it religious or anti-religious, wise or foolish, must be left to the influence of opinion, and not of the police. When opinion takes action within the domain of the laws insuring public order, morality or decency, then only it is within the domain of the State . . . [and] the sole function of the State is to punish the illegal action and not to amend the vicious opinion. The Third Principle is that the attempt by the State to control great organizations within it by any other machinery except by punishing acts of the members contrary to law is . . . futile and michievous.[87]

Harrison then proceeded to apply these principles to the Falk Laws.

> It is obvious . . . that the new laws introduce as rigid a system of state intervention in religion as it is possible to conceive. It does not apply to Catholics alone. . . . It reduces every Christian community to the position of a government bureau and makes Prince Bismarck the Pope of all religious bodies in the Kingdom except the Jews. This is not so much the creating of a new State Church. It is rather creating a new religious department of the State. . . . His [Bismarck's] grand idea is a pliant official bureau (whether worked by renegade Catholics, Old Catholics or common tools is unimportant) which shall use the name of the Catholic religion to control Catholic votes, to drill the Catholic schools, in a word, to govern the Catholic population thru an obsequious official priesthood. If this be not the quintessence of a State Church, interference in religion, state control of opinion, what do these things mean? If the Catholic Church is fomenting rebellion, sedition or treason, try the guilty Catholics, Churchmen or laymen, under the laws of rebellion, sedition or treason. . . . But you are asking only to choose the textbooks of boys' seminaries and priests' colleges, to nominate priests, to select curates as you select tide waiters and telegraph clerks, to get priests for three years to study your theology in your universities. . . . And you really think that treason and sedition will disappear if you can only have the whipping of the little

---

[87] Compare these ideas of Harrison with those of the writer in *The Spectator*, December 13, 1873, quoted above.

boys and settling the curriculum in theology? . . . [The Catholic Church] was practically a free church; you are trying to make it a State Church. . . . If it is dangerous now what will it be . . . when every priest is a certified public official, every sermon is *de part le roi* and every lesson or lecture in a college has the Imprimatur of a Pope in jack-boots?

Finally, Harrison said:

We in England know the whole story of these state interventions in religion. We have tried them all and are sick of them all—Elizabeth, Penal Laws, Conventicle Acts. . . . We know how all these attempts to control communions obnoxious to the State have recoiled on the State that tried them. . . . The attempt of Prince Bismarck seems to embrace every evil principle which the history of state religions and religious persecutions combined can exhibit.[88]

The *Edinburgh Review* carried an article already referred to,[89] basically anti-papal and anti-clerical, yet opposed to the Bismarckian ecclesiastical legislation. It asserted the right of every sovereign power to be supreme in its own domain and to take "proper measures to assert its independence and authority" especially when "threatened by an occult foreign power" which "denies in principle the sovereign rights of the State." But it argued that

. . . Government in so doing should keep within the proper boundaries. . . . To break the independent life of the Church and to turn it into a mere branch of the Civil Service for the purpose of opposing ultramontanism is a remedy worse than the disease.[90]

The article then proceeded to criticize almost every one of the steps taken by Bismarck during the previous two and a half years. The Pulpit Paragraph it called an "exceptional law" unnecessary in the face of already existing German laws. The School Supervision Bill it considered "undeniable in principle," but in practice "as applied to the Catholic schools . . . simply a denial of their right to exist at all." The Jesuit Law it deemed "an arbitrary and ineffective measure" which "without any legal proceedings" forced "several hundreds of German citizens . . . to emigrate from their country;" and at the

[88] Frederic Harrison, "Public Affairs," *Fortnightly Review,* XXI (February, 1874), 286-294.

[89] Cf. the discussion of the terms of the Falk Laws above, footnote 34.

[90] "Prince Bismarck and the Church of Rome," *Edinburgh Review,* CXXXIX (April, 1874), 363-364.

same time "was accepted by the whole Catholic world as a declaration of war" and "molded the German Catholics into one compact body." [91] Its severest strictures, however, were reserved for the Falk Laws. Concerning the Law on the Education of the Clergy, it felt that "the intention of thus bringing the Catholic clergy within the pale of general culture is excellent" but doubted "whether it can be accomplished by force and intolerance." [92]

The writer went on to defend the right of any church, including the Roman Catholic, to select and educate its own clergy:

> . . . in truth, no Protestant Church in the world, whether established or free, would for a moment endure such bondage. Try it in Scotland; you would be told that this is Erastianism run mad and the people would rather go out on the hillside to pray than to obey such tyranny. Try it in England; not a member of the Church of England whether clerical or lay would tolerate for a moment the despotic intervention of the government in every act of the spiritual life of the nation. A church which ceases to educate, institute and govern its members ceases to be any church at all.[93]

Finally, the writer analyzed the underlying spirit of the Falk Laws, and estimated their chances of success:

> The whole spirit of these laws is to make every form of religious belief or organization as subservient to the State as a Prussian recruit is to the rattan of a corporal. That we abhor and denounce as an intolerable oppression and it is only by the strangest perversion of judgement that any Englishman can have imagined that the cause of true religious liberty was identified with the policy of Prince Bismarck. . . . The gravest fault a statesman can commit is to make a law which cannot be executed. . . . If the Bishops are put in prison, as Archbishop Ledochowski and the Bishop of Treves have already been, they will only be made martyrs; but there is no more dangerous man than a martyr. . . . We must, therefore, come to the conclusion that with these laws the government have engaged themselves in a false path and that the result of the policy will prove the truth of Luther's saying 'You cannot draw the sword against a ghost.' [94]

These were the chief legislative features of the domestic Kulturkampf from 1871 through 1874, and this was British printed opinion on them. The political and parliamentary struggle inside Prussia and

[91] *Ibid.*, pp. 373-375.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 377.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 378.
[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 379-382.

the German Empire after 1874 became so merged with the "internationalizing of the Kulturkampf" of 1874 and 1875, that British opinion on the later legislation of 1875 and 1876 was concerned as much with Bismarckian foreign policy as with the Kulturkampf itself. That period of British opinion must be left for analysis elsewhere.[95] But from what had been printed up to the close of 1874, one can draw some general conclusions on the attitude of the British press and periodicals.

At the outset of the Kulturkampf, virtually all the organs of public opinion were still in the mood of unreasoning fear of ultramontanism, carrying over from the reaction to the Vatican Council and the promulgation of papal infallibility. Because the *Times* and the weekly papers appeared when the events were still fresh, it is those sheets which commented most freely on the unfolding of the struggle in Germany. Their judgments and reactions were faster and sharper, but also more fluctuating. The monthly and quarterly magazines were farther from the event, and, consequently, their articles were more considered, more reserved in judgment, and more often expository rather than inflammatory. The *Times* long supported the Bismarckian charge of an international ultramontane plot involving the German clergy and the German Catholics, with the Jesuits the chief plotters; and it modified its support of that charge, hesitatingly and almost reluctantly, to criticize the methods of the ecclesiastical legislation. Even then it remained anti-papal.

The periodicals and reviews were no more pro-papal than the *Times*. Some of them were unfeignedly anti-Catholic and pro-Bismarckian from motives of Protestant "No Popery." Others were, from the start, highly critical of Bismarck's motives as well as his methods. The writers in most of the periodicals, however, were "liberals" who viewed the struggle more disinterestedly, having "some sympathy with both sides and unqualified sympathy with neither."

It is the last category of writers who illustrate the divergent currents of British opinion. They were predisposed to be anti-papal and anti-Catholic on the doctrinaire liberal assumption that the Pope and

[95] The diplomatic details of the "international Kulturkampf" of 1874 and 1875 may be followed in Lillian Parker Wallace, *The Papacy and European Diplomacy, 1869-1878* (Chapel Hill, 1948), pp. 187-260; and in Francis A. Arlinghaus "The Kulturkampf and European Diplomacy, 1871-1875," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVII (October, 1942), 340-375.

the Catholic Church were the enemies of the liberal triad of ideas—individual liberty, intellectual freedom, and religious toleration. But they were sufficiently discriminating to draw a distinction between the aim of the Kulturkampf—as they saw it—to combat the political influence of the Catholic Church and of the Vatican and the practical legislative means used by Bismarck to achieve that aim. And they were sufficiently consistent to condemn the Falk Laws, even though directed against the Catholic Church, since they saw those laws leading to the establishment of a state despotism in religion and violating their own sacred "liberal" precepts.

On the Jesuit Law, the liberalism of most of the writers deserted them. But on many of the other laws they considered Bismarck even more illiberal than the Catholic Church. They had little sympathy with the religious beliefs of Catholics, German or English, but every sympathy with their right to cherish those beliefs. They disliked the Falk Laws not out of respect for Catholics but out of respect for toleration. To them even Catholics—and in a few cases, even Jesuits—ought not to be the victims of "illiberalism."

The current of international anti-clericalism was thus not strong enough, even before 1875, to cause British observers to "throw up their hats" without discrimination for the Kulturkampf. They were at once anti-papal and anti-Bismarckian. They were destined to become even more severely critical of Bismarck with the "internationalizing of the Kulturkampf" in 1875. But pro-Catholic they never became.

University of Detroit

CATHOLIC EDUCATION in the THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL of BALTIMORE. II.

By

FRANCIS P. CASSIDY*

(Continued from October, 1948)

Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis called the attention of the members of the council to the confusion of advice and opinion already presented on this matter of parochial schools, and he maintained that the confusion would increase in the future because the idea of a parochial school was here mixed with that of a Catholic school. He urged that before proceeding further the bishops should decide what was a Catholic school. Elder and Ireland affirmed that a Catholic school was one "which is subject to the authority of the bishop and to ecclesiastical inspection through the bishop." Kenrick warned that it must be kept in mind not only what was right, but also what was expedient. Chatard felt that a school must be said to be Catholic which was held to be such in the judgment of the bishop; and John Loughlin of Brooklyn and James O'Connor of Nebraska agreed with this opinion. Ryan of Philadelphia defined a school as Catholic in which, besides letters, Christian doctrine was also taught by those who professed the Catholic faith and practised it in their lives. McQuaid felt that this definition expressed the meaning of a Catholic school quite well, and he hoped that the Church of the United States might have a great many schools of this kind, and Flasch of La Crosse approved McQuaid's observation. Corrigan testified that a Catholic school at Rome was understood to be one in which Christian doctrine was taught; to which Elder added that a Catholic school must be always open to the pastor who was largely responsible for it. Chatard urged that the suggestion made by him, viz., that a school was Catholic if judged so by the bishop, be given careful consideration because the opinion of a pastor might be prejudiced in favor of his own school, a viewpoint which prompted McCloskey of Louisville to warn that the opinion of a bishop might also be prejudiced.

Bishop Dwenger deprecated further discussion on this matter because he felt it would be pleasing to the Roman authorities if it were enacted that it was the right of the bishop to inspect the school.

* Father Cassidy is Associate Professor of the History of Education in the Catholic University of America.

Riordan, however, was convinced that in the West these school decrees could not be promulgated and ordered to be put into effect, and he asked that this whole section on the four fundamental regulations be referred to the special committee of bishops. But the general body judged otherwise, because only fourteen members supported Riordan's view. Henry Richter of Grand Rapids advocated that Catholic schools be approved by a diocesan school board, while Kenrick foresaw a danger in this suggestion because one must beware lest the rights of private individuals be injured. If the school was not a good one, no one had a right to enter it, and the civil law would not easily approve it. Kain of Wheeling was discouraged that no agreement could be reached on this question, and he urged that the special committee of the bishops be asked to report on what was a Catholic school.[89] Chatard declared that if the rights of private individuals were injured they might have recourse to the metropolitan and the Congregation of the Propaganda. But Ryan held out persistently for the council defining what was a Catholic school because the best interests of the clergy and laity demanded that this question be answered by the bishops. They accordingly approved by fifty-three votes the suggestion made by Chatard that a Catholic school was one which the bishop had judged to be such.[90]

The fourth and last basic regulation had now come before the session. It maintained that all Catholic parents were bound to send their children to parochial schools, unless they provided sufficiently and fully for their Christian education at home or at other Catholic schools. In this regulation provision was made with the approval of the bishop for sending children to other schools. The special committee appointed to report on Title VI and the *deputatio*[91] in charge of the same had felt that after the statement, "all Catholic parents are bound to send their children to parochial schools," there should be added these words from the Congregation's instruction of 1875: "eosque, si contumaces fuerint, absolvi non posse in Sacramento

[89] The special committee of bishops appointed in the council by Gibbons to report on Title VI were Heiss of Milwaukee, Gilmour of Cleveland, Francis McNeirny of Albany, and Michael O'Farrell of Trenton. Cf. *Acta et decreta*, p. lx.

[90] *Ibid.*, pp. lxiv f.

[91] The *deputatio* in charge of Title VI consisted of Archbishop Feehan of Chicago, chairman, with Bishops Spalding of Peoria, Flasch of La Crosse, and Cosgrove of Davenport.

poenitentiae." The special committee of the bishops recommended that in the opening sentence of the regulation it should read: "omnes parentes teneri" and not "omnes parentes debere." Feehan proposed a further emendation by suggesting that after the words quoted from the instruction there should be added the statement: "after the judgment of the bishop has been given whose duty it will be to judge of the contumacy." But Gilmour objected to this proposal as did likewise the majority of the fathers. Fitzgerald and McCloskey were not in favor of this fourth regulation at all, and they advocated that the whole section be deleted; but in spite of their views it was voted by the council that it be retained.[92]

Spalding of Peoria was deeply concerned about the addition of the words, quoted from the instruction of the Congregation of the Propaganda of 1875, to this fourth fundamental rule, and he requested the council to reconsider its action. Ireland noted that the wording in the *Schema* was comformable to the spirit of the instruction, while Healy proposed that in reconsidering this regulation it might be well to qualify "other Catholic schools" with the added clause: "where under the authority of the Ordinary the Catholic faith is taught." Kenrick denied that there was any law which bound private teachers to establish their schools under the authority of the bishops. Elder and Dwenger held otherwise, because in a previous decree it was asserted that the bishop had the power of judging who could be excused from attending Catholic schools. Gilmour observed that the added words said only "cannot be absolved" with no mention of bishop or priest. The Archbishop of Chicago warned that the Congregation was speaking only of a case where there was proximate danger of sinning or losing the faith; and John Ireland claimed that the words added had been wrenched from the context in the instruction and could lead to error. When it came to voting the added words were rejected by a vote of thirty-seven to thirty-two. The additional words suggested by Healy, qualifying "other Catholic schools," were also rejected with only five members of the council supporting his viewpoint.[93]

Concerning the decree in relation to priests and their visitation of parochial schools at least once a week, Ryan of Philadelphia and Healy of Portland were of the opinion that the visit of the pastor

[92] *Acta et decreta*, pp. lxiii ff.

[93] *Ibid.*, pp. lxvi f.

might interfere with the class schedule unless it was at the hour when religion was being taught. On the contrary, Dwenger felt that the decree should read that the pastor must visit the school twice a week at least, while Spalding believed that the pastor should visit his school every day. Gilmour preferred that the wording of the decree, as stated in the *Schema,* be retained, and he advised that catechism be taught by the pastor himself. It was finally agreed by practically all that the original wording of the decree charging pastors with the obligation of visiting their schools "at least once a week" be approved.[94]

As regards the decree concerning the laity in relation to certain rights and privileges conceded them in the parochial school, the bishops were unanimously agreed that the wording should be changed to read:

> Certain rights and privileges may be conceded to our laymen in respect to the schools, which in accordance with the diversity of places and the reserved rights of the priest as regards the appointment and dismissal of teachers, must be more accurately defined through diocesan statutes.[95]

Later, certain bishops felt that this wording seemed at least indirectly to give the right of removing religious to the priest, but Dwenger maintained there was no reason for this interpretation; it was said of the priest in this matter that his rights must be defined accurately through a diocesan synod. Seghers thought that the meaning would be clearer if after the word "teacher" there was added the word "secular." Marty further suggested that the wording read: "reserving the rights of the bishop as to regulars and of the priest as to seculars." Keane of Richmond modified this suggestion by substituting in the Latin form of the decree the word "ecclesiasticis" for the word "sacerdotis," so that the wording would read: "salvis juribus ecclesiasticis quoad magistros" etc. Ultimately fifty-six members of the council agreed to this proposed change, which became an integral part of the final wording of the decree.[96]

The *deputatio* in charge of Title VI reported that they favored five or more priests on the diocesan board of examination instead of three as stated in the decree dealing with teachers. Watterson proposed that this whole decree be deleted, a view shared by Alemany. When

[94] *Ibid.,* p. lxv.

[95] *Loc. cit.*

[96] *Ibid.,* p. lxvii.

the vote was taken, thirty-two were in favor of the proposal and twenty-six opposed. The Bishop of Cleveland then requested that the vote be taken again, and it was decided a second time by the more decisive number of forty-one to thirty that the decree be expunged. Spalding, desiring that it be retained, appealed to the members of the council for further deliberation regarding this decree; whereupon Patrick Ryan then proposed that in place of three or five priests, one only be designated as was done in England, a suggestion to which Watterson and Spalding were agreeable. Healy, with Ryan of Philadelphia approving, emended the wording so that instead of three priests it would read one or more; and with this change Spalding was satisfied. Dwenger made known that he had a diocesan commission, consisting of nine priests, who gratuitously made a visitation of all the schools annually. But the discussion was closed on this point and the fathers of the council approved the emendation made by Bishop Healy.[97]

Considerable reflection was given the regulation concerning the qualifying examination demanded of teachers who in the future were to teach in parish schools. To the question of Loughlin of Brooklyn, asking whether religious also were to be examined, Ryan of Philadelphia answered by all means they must be examined, because it had been found from experience that there were many unprepared among religious who were sent to teach in parochial schools. Chatard suggested that they be examined, not by a commission, but at home by members of their own community. Archbishop Ryan responded that, if this concession was made, then it was a lost cause trying to reform the schools and to raise them to a higher standard. Alemany, himself a Dominican, said he believed that a measure of this kind reflected dishonor on religious and branded them with ignominy. He urged that some other way be found to get the religious to send suitable teachers into the parochial schools. Watterson agreed with Alemany, and he commented that it was possible for the examiners to favor one community more than another. O'Connor of Nebraska maintained that religious needed this examination and unless certain action was taken the necessary preparation would not be given to novices to enable them to teach satisfactorily. John Ireland recommended that this idea of the examination be adopted because the laity even expected it, for some had complained that many inexperienced

[97] *Ibid.*, p. lxv.

religious women were assigned to the duty of teaching in parochial schools. The decree was then approved by the council.[98]

Up to this point, no mention had been made in the meetings concerning the matter of textbooks used in Catholic schools. Bishop Ireland called the attention of the bishops to this very important item in school legislation. He noted that the question of suitable textbooks was not included in any of the decrees, and he urged that in parochial schools books written by Catholic authors should be used as much as possible. He remarked that a statement to this effect could be inserted appropriately in a related decree. This recommendation was agreeable to almost all, and the importance of Catholic textbooks was emphasized in the decree dealing with priests and their obligations toward parochial schools.[99]

It remained for the bishops to consider the last two tentative decrees, one of which concerned superiors and professors, and the other which gave directions for mixed academies and colleges. Keane felt that in the decree concerning the responsibilities of college officials toward the moral formation of students it should be urged that they guard cautiously the morals of students not only on campus, but also when they left the campus. This suggestion was well received, and it was decided to have it so stated in the decree. Corrigan was of the opinion that the whole decree in regard to mixed academies and colleges should be expunged; and while Spalding contended that he could see no evil arising from mixed academies of girls, he did admit it was otherwise in regard to mixed colleges of boys. However, Seghers, with whom Ireland agreed, felt this decree should be retained. The Archbishop of Oregon City declared that in the West colleges and academies could not be maintained without the support of non-Catholics, and in this decree a remedy was offered for the dangers that might arise in such mixed schools. O'Connor of Nebraska confirmed Seghers' statement, but he warned that unwilling non-Catholics must not be forced to be present at prayers and other church services. Elder believed that these mixed schools favored indifferentism. When Catholics saw their non-Catholic fellow students living well and without the aid of prayer and the sacraments, they were prone to believe that there was no great power present in Catholic practices. At this point Archbishop Gibbons suggested that

[98] *Ibid.*, pp. lxv f.

[99] *Ibid.*, p. lxvii.

the whole matter might be taken care of by publishing the instruction of the Congregation of the Propaganda of April 25; 1868, dealing with mixed schools in an appendix to the council's legislation. He recalled that the cardinals at the meeting held in Rome in 1883 had approved leaving out of the decrees certain things which seemed "magis odiosa."[100]

To Archbishop Corrigan the entire decree was unsatisfactory for three reasons:

1. It was based on the instruction of 1868 which could be read by anyone if placed in the appendix; and in this document relatives and friends were not permitted to visit non-Catholic students in a mixed school without the superior being present. This regulation was so foreign to American traditions and customs that it could not be kept.

2. Discussions concerning religion could not be entirely prevented. It was hardly fair to forbid the Catholic party when interrogated to explain Catholic doctrine and answer objections. If the disputants have recourse to abusive words with mutual offense to each other, the sin would be committed in the manner and not in the thing itself.

3. It was not an easy matter to insist that non-Catholics attend their places of worship without the discipline of the school suffering.[101]

Richter of Grand Rapids felt that the decree as written seemed to favor mixed schools. To obviate the possibility of such interpretaiton Healy suggested that a statement be inserted to this effect: "though we do not absolutely prohibit the reception of non-Catholics," etc., and this suggestion was accepted by almost all the bishops. Corrigan proposed that the sentence dealing with the prohibiting of discussions on religion be omitted, but the fathers by a vote of fifty-eight in favor decided that it be retained. Chatard advocated omitting the reference to non-Catholics attending Mass and other church services at their own option, but Ireland was of the opinion that non-Catholics were a scandal to Catholic students when they were present at Mass and did not kneel, while Spalding, on the contrary, maintained that Catholic students resented that they were compelled to be present at services when non-Catholics were excused. McQuaid thought that the whole decree ought to be suppressed. He urged that American conditions were not sufficiently understood at Rome. Non-Catholics should be admitted to our academies

[100] *Ibid.*, pp. lxvii f.

[101] *Ibid.*, p. lxviii.

and colleges, but they should be obliged to keep all the rules; yet they ought to be so few in number that the school would be predominantly Catholic. Gilmour was of the same opinion. Archbishop Corrigan remarked that the instruction of the Holy Office of June 1, 1866, was not a general law, but a special one given to the Provincial Council of Westminster. Apropos of this observation Seghers commented that this instruction was known to many priests who thereby caused scruples to religious regarding this question of mixed schools. He further contended that the character of American non-Catholics was not sufficiently known to Rome. The Roman authorities thought that they had fixed principles to which they adhered firmly, but Seghers claimed that this estimate of them was far from the truth. Ultimately the proposal of the Bishop of Rochester to drop the whole decree was rejected with only four of the bishops agreeing. The suggestion of Chatard to omit any reference to non-Catholics attending ecclesiastical functions was accepted, and the decree amended in this way was approved by almost all the bishops present.[102]

Concerning the welfare and Christian education of Negroes the council recognized a deep sense of duty on the part of the American clergy toward colored Catholics, and it urged that renewed efforts be made to convert the large numbers of Negroes outside the Church. Attention was called to the decree enacted by the Second Plenary Council in this regard, together with the instruction given on the same matter to the apostolic delegate by the Prefect of the Congregation of the Propaganda for the benefit of the present council.[103] Gibbons had suggested at the meeting held in Rome in 1883 that a definite plan be devised by which money might be satisfactorily raised for this purpose. Consequently he advocated the establishment of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith in every diocese and parish of the United States with a view in part of assisting financially American bishops who had a Negro problem. He further solicited the aid of the Prefect of Propaganda by asking him to help supply missionaries for this good cause. At this same meeting Archbishop John J. Williams of Boston had recommended that, if a special day were fixed on which the collection was to be taken up, and the Holy Father were to grant a plenary indulgence for this pious work, a richer collection would result, and at least a part of it might be used for

[102] *Ibid.*, pp. lxviii f.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. lxxii.

the care and conversion of Negroes. The cardinals at the time commented at length on these proposals made by the American prelates and expressed themselves in favor of the collection, provided it was clearly understood that a part of it was to be used for the conversion of Negroes and Indians.[104]

In the discussion which took place at Baltimore relative to the Negro and Indian problem, the first Sunday of Lent was decided upon as a fitting day for the collection, and it was agreed that a committee of bishops be appointed for receiving and distributing it. Keane of Richmond felt that the question should be referred to this committee whether it would be expedient to erect a college for educating those who might wish to serve perpetually the missions for Indians and Negroes. Gilmour made known that the authorities at Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg had already offered that institution for a work of this kind. In regard to this offer, Gibbons was fearful that the committee of bishops might refuse it on account of the heavy debt with which the college was then burdened.[105] The proposal of Keane, however, was approved by the bishops.[106] The Bishop of Richmond further suggested that the work among the Negroes be done as quickly as possible, and he made it known that he was not in favor of getting religious from Europe to convert the colored lest it harm the cause. Protestants, he feared, might make

[104] *Relatio collationum*, p. 27.

[105] In 1881, Mount Saint Mary's College faced a financial crisis. Archbishop Gibbons suggested "a conference with the creditors asking for a reduction of interest, an appeal to the alumni, and great economy at home." Cf. Archives of Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, hereafter referred to as AMSMC, James Gibbons to Patrick Hennessy, Baltimore, February 28, 1881. In October of the same year, the archbishop wrote to the Reverend William Byrne, President of the College, that the "sums sent to him so far for the College total $15,625, and he added: "My own donation is available at any time." AMSMC, Emmitsburg, James Gibbons to William Byrne, Baltimore, October 28, 1881. The following March, the President of the College was pleased to report to His Grace that the court released the college from the custody of the receiver. He further stated that "although we are now out of the hands of the Receiver we are not by any means out of debt." Cf. BCA, 76-0-2, William Byrne to James Gibbons, Emmitsburg, March 7, 1882. Two days later he sent the archbishop a printed statement indicating that total liabilities then stood at $58,880; all that could be carried in safety was $30,000; and the remainder was to be paid off in the next year. Cf. BCA, 76-0-2, William Byrne to James Gibbons, Emmitsburg, March 9, 1882.

[106] *Acta et decreta*, p. lxxv.

capital of this fact, and through it hold the Negro up to ridicule. Kain of Wheeling was quite agreed. He preferred to have colored priests to work among the Negroes than to have missionaries brought from Europe, and he felt that colored candidates for the priesthood should be trained together with the whites in the regular seminaries. Ryan of Philadelphia maintained that schools were the best and only means of making good Catholic Negroes. Thomas A. Becker of Wilmington disagreed. He contended that often those who were educated in school lapsed into heresy, especially among the Methodists. He advocated that missionaries in the United States who were to work among them should be sent to Louvain or to the seminary at Emmitsburg where they might be trained specifically for work of this kind.[107]

VII. Following the final session of the council which was held on December 7, preparations were promptly made to get the documents pertaining to the *Acta et decreta* in order, so that they might be sent to Rome as early as possible for review by the Vatican examiners and consultors. In February, 1885, Denis J. O'Connell,[108] who had been chosen by Archbishop Gibbons to present the documents to the cardinals of the Congregation of the Propaganda, sailed from New York bearing the *Acta et decreta,* and with them instructions to take care of all pertinent matters preliminary to the arrival of the American bishops who were charged with the duty of representing the hierarchy of the United States concerning approval of the conciliar legislation.

The bishops eventually selected by Gibbons to carry out this important mission were John Moore of St. Augustine, Joseph Dwenger of Fort Wayne, and Richard Gilmour of Cleveland. In replying to a letter of Dwenger concerning his going to Rome, Gibbons indicated

[107] *Ibid.*, p. lxxiii.

[108] Denis J. O'Connell (1849-1927), was a priest of the Diocese of Richmond. He was invited by Archbishop Gibbons to come to Baltimore, where he arrived on June 29, 1883, to assist him as secretary in matters pertaining to the future council. He later was one of the secretaries to the council; was chosen to deliver the *Acta et decreta* to the Roman authorities; served as Rector of the American College in Rome (1885-1895); was the third Rector of the Catholic University of America (1903-1908); was made Auxiliary Bishop of San Francisco where he remained (1908-1912); and was appointed Bishop of Richmond in 1912, serving that diocese for fourteen years until he resigned his see in 1926. He died at Richmond on January 1, 1927.

that Moore had accepted the responsibility entrusted to him, and that he wished Dwenger to do likewise. He wrote:

. . . I am very glad that you are disposed to go to Rome, if I advise, and I so advise and recommend. Rev. Dr. O'Connell sails on Wednesday, with the Acta et Decreta; Dr. O'C. will present the documents on arriving, and Right Rev. Bishop Moore will soon follow. Your Lordship and the Bishop of St. Augustine will do all you can to advocate the approval of the Decrees.[109]

Gilmour received a letter from Gibbons on February 19, 1885, saying: "I would be pleased if you could visit Rome in the spring. Your presence there would contribute much to obtaining the approbation of the decrees." [110] Three days later Gilmour replied, making known to Gibbons that he preferred to be spared going to Rome. He qualified, however, his reluctance to go by stating:

. . . I deem the approbation of the decrees so important that I would do almost anything to have them approved as they came from our hands. The whole body of laws is so well balanced that I think it would be a sad disaster to have them touched, or changed. We well know the difficulty we had to mould so as to balance and suit all, and if they change in Rome they will do so without the knowledge we have here. If you later on think I should go, I will go at all inconvenience, so please let me know and I will arrange accordingly.[111]

Gilmour seems to have received no word from Baltimore in reply, because evidently Gibbons felt for the time being that Moore and Dwenger would be sufficient for the purpose in Rome. Later, however, he suggested to Gilmour that he go unofficially, lest the Vatican might think that the American bishops were trying to bring pressure to bear on the ecclesiastical authorities in the Eternal City.[112] Gilmour was not at all pleased with this suggestion, as were neither Elder nor McQuaid. They asserted that a bishop who was to explain and maintain the decrees in Rome should be given an official position as a repre-

[109] AUND, Fort Wayne Papers, 1857-1915, James Gibbons to Joseph Dwenger, Baltimore, February 9, 1885.

[110] Archives of the Diocese of Cleveland, hereafter referred to as ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, Baltimore, February 10, 1885.

[111] BCA, 79-0-18, Richard Gilmour to James Gibbons, Cleveland, February 13, 1885.

[112] *Ibid.*, Copybook of James Gibbons, pp. 151 f., James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, March 23, 1885.

sentative of the council.[113] Gilmour observed that Dwenger would not be forceful enough as a member of the committee of bishops, and he recommended that it be strengthened by the appointment of McQuaid who was "formally known in Rome."[114] Gibbons agreed that as regards McQuaid, "a stronger and more zealous" prelate could not be selected. However, he was fearful of having Gilmour and McQuaid sent officially, and he urged that the two, apart from their interest in the decrees, go from a "motive of health."[115]

With Gibbons hesitating to approve Gilmour as an official delegate, Archbishop Elder wrote to him strongly urging that the Bishop of Cleveland should be sent to Rome as an agent of the American bishops to speak and act in their name.[116] McQuaid was of the opinion that in a matter of this kind the Archbishop of Baltimore alone should not accredit such an agent, but that he should act with the co-operation of the other archbishops. "Thus united," he stated, "he need not fear adverse criticism for himself. But he will get plenty of it should there be radical changes through his default."[117] Whether or not this criticism was carried to Gibbons, and very probably it was, the apostolic delegate of the late council sent similar letters to Elder and Gilmour on the same day, May 7, 1885, in which he made known that he had conferred with the Archbishops of Boston and Philadelphia, the Coadjutor of New York, and the Bishops of Peoria and St. Paul on the expediency of Gilmour's going to Rome, and that all of them agreed that the presence of Gilmour in Rome was "very desirable."[118]

The qualifications of the three prelates chosen to champion the

[113] ADC, Letters—Elder, William Henry Elder to Richard Gilmour, Cincinnati, March 25, 1885; *Ibid.*, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, Bernard McQuaid to Richard Gilmour, Rochester, April 12, 1885.

[114] BCA, 79-D-13, Richard Gilmour to James Gibbons, Cleveland, March 21, 1885.

[115] *Ibid.*, Copybook of James Gibbons, pp. 151 f., James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, March 23, 1885.

[116] *Ibid.*, 79-K-5, William Henry Elder to James Gibbons, Cincinnati, May 4, 1885.

[117] ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, Bernard McQuaid to Richard Gilmour, Rochester, April 12, 1885.

[118] Archives of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, Letters—1885, James Gibbons to W. H. Elder, Baltimore, May 7, 1885; ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, May 7, 1885.

views of the American bishops in Rome can be discerned from the correspondence that is extant relative to matters of the council. John Moore was chosen because he was evidently a mild man, and at home in the Italian language.[119] Gilmour had taken an active part in formulating the decrees, and he was qualified by reason of his large experience to give useful information, and to show forth the grave reasons which prompted the fathers of the council in adopting the measures which they now submitted to the final action of the Holy See.[120] As for Dwenger, he understood and spoke German well, and he could carry on discussions in relation to the decrees with Cardinal Franzelin in the German tongue.[121] The German influence at this time was, of course, strong in the Church in the United States. Gilmour and Moore felt that this influence had taken such proportions that while in Rome they prepared a document showing how the Germans "are trying to germanize the Church in the United States, and we complain of the undue influence they are allowed to exercise at the Propaganda in the appointment of Bishops and the like." [122] Dwenger himself felt that his "intimate confidential relations with the Propaganda" made him a desirable Roman agent.[123] How much truth there was in this estimate may be judged from a statement concerning Dwenger made by Denis O'Connell in writing to Gibbons. O'Connell admitted that Dwenger had worked hard and zealously for the council, but he asserted "you can safely take 'cum grano salis' what Mgr. Dwenger writes, especially about himself. He is very well pleased with himself." [124] O'Connell's criticism seems to agree with the complaints made against Dwenger to Gibbons in a joint letter of Gilmour and Moore. They declared that he "was excessively vain and boastful of his influence in Rome," and that he showed a marked desire "to curry favor" with the authorities of the Propaganda. They concluded by hoping that "the Bishops who will

[119] BCA, 79-P-13, D. J. O'Connell to James Gibbons, Rome, July 28, 1885; ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, Baltimore, Aug. 18, 1885.

[120] ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, Baltimore, May 7, 1885.

[121] BCA, 79-I-13, D. J. O'Connell to James Gibbons, Rome, April 12, 1885.

[122] *Ibid.*, 79-O-11, John Moore to James Gibbons, Rome, July 15, 1885.

[123] *Ibid.*, 79-D-3, Joseph Dwenger to James Gibbons, Fort Wayne, February 4, 1885.

[124] *Ibid.*, 79-H-11, D. J. O'Connell to James Gibbons, Rome, March 29, 1885.

have to undertake a similar labor after the next council may have the good fortune to be able to work together harmoniously." [125]

It was to be expected that periodically the reports emanating from Rome concerning the examination of the decrees would be disturbing.[126] The three cardinals—Simeoni, Franzelin, and Jacobini—who had conducted the preliminary conferences with the Americans at Rome in 1883, were the leading personalities now in charge of examining the decrees, with Aloysius Sepiacci as the chief consultor. How much serious objection, if any, was raised concerning specifically the educational legislation passed by the council is difficult to ascertain. The available correspondence dealing with the final action on the decrees is quite general in character, except in the particular case of the relations of bishops to priests. It is safe to assume that, if any major objections were raised by the Roman authorities to the educational legislation of the council, reference to it would have been made in the correspondence that passed between the American representatives in Rome and the Archbishop of Baltimore. Pope Leo XIII had great respect for American opinion, and he insisted that the viewpoint of the bishops in the United States be given careful consideration.[127] Ultimately the formal approval of the decrees of the council was given by the Holy Father in an audience to Archbishop Jacobini, secretary to the Propaganda, on September 10, 1885. Eleven days later on September 21, Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Propaganda, sent the formal decree of approval of the Third Plenary Council to the Archbishop of Baltimore; [128] and early in 1886 the official *Acta et decreta* were published in this country.

A comparative study of the unofficial and official decrees of the council reveals that little substantial change was made in the educational legislation. As regards major seminaries, ascetical theology was not included in the course of studies in the official decrees. It

[125] *Ibid.*, 79-T-2, Richard Gilmour and John Moore to James Gibbons, October 3, 1885.

[126] *Ibid.*, 79-F-9, D. J. O'Connell to James Gibbons, Rome, March 8, 1885; *Ibid.*, 79-G-9, Joseph Dwenger to James Gibbons, Rome, March 19, 1885; *Ibid.*, 79-G-13, Richard Gilmour to James Gibbons, Cleveland, March 21, 1885; ADC, No. A, Bishops, 1872-1888, James Gibbons to Richard Gilmour, Baltimore, April 3, 1885; BCA, 79-P-13, D. J. O'Connell to James Gibbons, Rome, July 28, 1885.

[127] BCA, 79-I-15, Joseph Dwenger to James Gibbons, Rome, April 13, 1885.

[128] *Ibid.*, 79-S-S, Joannes Simeoni to James Gibbons, Rome, September 21, 1885.

was merely recommended that spiritual directors of seminaries give seminarians an appreciation of ascetical theology both in theory and in practice.[129] Concerning the *seminarium principale,* which later became the foundation of the Catholic University of America, the officials of the Propaganda effected certain changes in the language of the decrees. All matters pertaining to administration, discipline, and plan of studies, after they had been deliberated upon by the American bishops, were to be subjected to the examination and approval of Rome.[130] By inserting this directive it was clear that the right of the Holy See in regard to approving the constitution and program of studies for Catholic universities before papal approval would be given to their establishment was properly safeguarded. Propaganda further advised that the American bishops continue to send worthy students to the ecclesiastical colleges at Rome and Louvain, even after such a *seminarium principale* had been established in the United States.[131] It is evident that this recommendation was intended to provide for the future welfare of these centers which had hitherto enjoyed the patronage of the American Church.

Minor changes were also made in the decrees dealing with the education of Catholic youth. In the four fundamental rules which were to govern the whole educational legislation, rule one was amended to read that a parochial school must be erected within two years from the promulgation of the council's legislation unless the bishop saw fit to grant a further delay on account of more than ordinarily grave difficulties to be overcome.[132] In the unofficial decrees it read "unless in the judgment of the bishop the erection or maintenance of the school be impossible."[133] Rule two was modified to the extent that a priest who, within the aforesaid time, hindered by serious negligence the building and maintenance of a school, deserved removal from that parish only after he disregarded the repeated admonitions of the bishop.[134] The unofficial decree had stated that, if he gravely neglected to build the school or to maintain it, he could and must be removed

[129] Official *Acta et decreta,* pp. 85 f.
[130] *Ibid.,* p. 94.
[131] *Loc. cit.*
[132] *Ibid.,* p. 104.
[133] *Acta et decreta,* p. 60.
[134] Official *Acta et decreta,* p. 104.

from the church.[135] Rule three advocated that the mission or parish neglecting to aid the priest in the erection and support of a school so that, on account of this negligence, the same could not exist, was to be reprimanded by the bishop, and by every prudent and efficient means urged to supply the necessary "subsidia." [136] The unofficial decree had recommended not only a reprimand from the bishop, but also if the same state of affairs continued the mission or parish was to be given spiritual punishments.[137] No change was made in rule four.

Concerning the school privileges of the laity, the unofficial decree had stated that certain rights and privileges, which should be more accurately defined in diocesan synods, must be conceded to laymen in respect to the schools, reserving ecclesiastical rights as regards the appointment and dismissal of teachers.[138] The official decree added further exclusive ecclesiastical rights: "necnon quoad disciplinam, et directionem doctrinae." [139]

In regard to the new legislation on teachers in parochial schools, and the time and mode of the qualifying examination, a distinction was made between religious who belonged to diocesan congregations and those who had superiors or general directors according to constitutions approved by the Holy See. In the unofficial decrees both had been subjected to the same regulation, and the cost of the examination was to be borne by the examinee.[140] In the official decrees no mention was made of the cost of the examination, and quite different regulations were laid down for the two classes of teachers regarding the qualifying examination. For members of diocesan communities the time and mode of the examination was practically the same. But for religious who were not members of a diocesan community the bishop had the right to visit the parochial schools committed to their care, according to the constitution, *Romanos Pontifices* of May 8, 1881, and if he discovered in this way or in other ways, that certain teachers were unequal to their duty, he might notify the superior that within a reasonable time this condition had to be remedied. If the superior neglected to do so, then it should be reported to the

[135] *Acta et decreta*, p. 60.
[136] Official *Acta et decreta*, p. 104.
[137] *Acta et decreta*, p. 60.
[138] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[139] Official *Acta et decreta*, p. 108.
[140] *Acta et decreta*, p. 63.

Congregation of the Propaganda so that effective steps for remedying the situation might be taken. The Propaganda was insistent that agreements already made by bishops with the superiors of religious communities, or to be entered into in the future, respecting the appointment and removal of teachers, and the method of teaching the profane sciences must be carefully observed. It further advised that bishops act in common with the proper superiors of communities for the purpose of establishing normal schools, where needed, in convenient houses, wherein junior members might be professionally trained under capable instructors of pedagogy and other sciences. If necessary, the bishop might call in the authority of the Propaganda in his efforts to provide in this way for the professional training of parochial school teachers in order that they might be thoroughly prepared for their high office.[141]

The educational decrees of the Third Plenary Council[142] were the culmination of legislation that was initiated in the Synod of 1791, continued through the seven provincial councils (1829-1849), and expressed more forcibly in the First (1852) and Second (1866) Plenary Councils. The laws enacted regarding seminaries, from the synodal legislation of 1791 through the succeeding years down to 1884, were naturally based on similar regulations laid down by the Council of Trent. But the statutes that meanwhile had been passed concerning the education of Catholic youth were perforce more compelling, and led steadily toward the determined stand taken by the American hierarchy on this question in their plenary meeting of 1884. The parish school was a subject of keen interest to all the bishops in this country since the appointment of John Carroll as the first bishop in the United States. They were deeply conscious of the danger to faith and morals which Catholic boys and girls were encountering in the common schools. The only remedy was the establishment of parochial schools wherein religious teachers were to devote themselves to the work of the Christian formation of the young.

[141] Official *Acta et decreta*, pp. 108-110.

[142] For a general treatment of the Third Plenary Council cf. James A. Corcoran, "The Decrees of the Third Plenary Council," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XI (April, 1886), 344-356; and Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884* (New York, 1932), pp. 221-249. An interesting and informative account of the relations of Bernard J. McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester, to the council may be found in Frederick J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid* (Rochester, 1926), II, 289-359.

Despite the difficulty of obtaining all the teachers necessary, the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852 had urged the hierarchy of that day:

> We exhort the bishops, and in view of the great evils which usually result from the defective education of youth, we beseech them through the bowels of the mercy of God to see that schools be established in connection with all the churches of the diocese; and, if it be necessary and circumstances permit, to provide from the revenues of the Church to which the school is attached,[143] for the support of competent teachers.

This same decree was incorporated into similar conciliar legislation passed by the council of 1866.[144]

Between the councils of 1866 and 1884 there was a remarkable growth of the public school system in the United States, and consequently the dominant anxiety of bishops and clergy was the problem of Catholic children in these schools. With the rise of the state school, the religious aim in education had been almost completely eliminated. While the educational leaders who contributed to the upbuilding of state school systems advocated that religious instruction be given in the home and in the Church, the Catholic hierarchy realized full well that when religion was banished from the school secularism would spread rapidly. This point of view was clearly expressed in the pastoral letter of 1884:

> In days like ours, when error is so pretentious and aggressive, every one needs to be as completely armed as possible with sound knowledge,—not only the clergy, but the people also that they may be able to withstand the noxious influences of popularized irreligion. . . .
>
> Now the three great educational agencies are the home, the Church and the school. These mould men and shape society. Therefore, each of them to do its part well, must foster religion. But many, unfortunately, while avowing that religion should be the light and the atmosphere of the home and of the Church, are content to see it excluded from the school, and even advocate as the best school system that which necessarily excludes religion. Few surely will deny that childhood and youth are the periods of life when the character ought especially to be subjected to religious influences. Nor can we ignore the palpable fact that the school is an important factor in the forming of childhood and youth,—so important that its influence often outweighs that of home and Church. . . . To shut

[143] *Concilii plenarii totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori habitum anno 1852* (Baltimorae, 1853), decretum XIII.

[144] *Concilii plenarii Baltimorensis II acta et decreta* (Baltimorae, 1868), decretum 450.

religion out of the school, and keep it for home and the Church, is logically, to train up a generation that will consider religion good for home and the Church, but not for the practical business of real life.[145]

The accuracy of this warning of 1884 concerning the devastating effects of the secularization of education are at once apparent in the statement issued sixty-three years later by the American bishops assembled at Washington in November, 1947, when they said:

Secularism, or the practical exclusion of God from human thinking and living, is at the root of the world's travail today. It was the fertile soil in which such social monstrosities as Fascism, Nazism, and Communism could germinate and grow. It is doing more than anything else to blight our heritage of Christian culture, which integrates the various aspects of human life and renders to God the things that are God's. . . .

Our youth problem would not be so grave if the place of God in life were emphasized in the rearing of children. There would be less danger for the future of our democratic institutions if secularism were not so deeply entrenched in much of our thinking on education.[146]

In view of the increasing abandonment of religious influence in the public school system, some of the provincial councils which had been held between 1852 and 1866 had legislated for an outright system of parochial school training. The provincial councils of Cincinnati particularly were quite insistent that if the faith of Catholic boys and girls was to be preserved in the United States, the universal establishment of the parish school was imperative. In this respect the foresight and sacrifice of the German parishes were held up as a model to all others to follow. In the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati held in 1858 (the Province of Cincinnati extended at that time from the Alleghanies to the Mississippi), it was decreed:

It is the judgment of the Fathers that all pastors are bound, under pain of mortal sin, to provide a Catholic school in every parish or congregation subject to them, where this can be done; and in order that each Ordinary may know what are the parishes in which the obligation exists, they decree that the Tridentine Law, S. xxii, c. ix is to be practically en-

---

[145] Guilday, *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy (1792-1919)*, pp. 244 f.

[146] New York *Times*, November 16, 1947.

forced, by which the rectors of churches are required each year to render an exact account to their Ordinaries of all the revenues accruing to their churches in any way, which they therefore strictly enjoin as to be observed by the aforesaid rector.[147]

Naturally the financial outlay involved in the erection and maintenance of parochial schools, together with the obvious dangers to the faith of Catholic children in public schools, was a perplexing problem for many American bishops; and eventually the whole matter was taken to Propaganda. As a result in 1875, the Congregation of the Propaganda, issued an "Instruction to the Bishops of the United States concerning the Public Schools" in which Catholics were directed to establish their own schools. The instruction read:

All are agreed that there is nothing so needed to this end as the establishment of Catholic schools in every place—and schools in no way inferior to the public ones. Every effort, then, must be directed toward starting Catholic schools where they are not, and, where they are, toward enlarging them and providing them with better accommodations and equipment until they have nothing to suffer, as regards teachers or equipment, by comparison with the public schools.[148]

It is not surprising, then, that when the bishops of the Baltimore council of 1884 took up for discussion the important issue of the Catholic school they should have come to the conclusion that the time had arrived not only for exhorting Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools, but for commanding them to do so. The decree read as follows:

Therefore we not only exhort Catholic parents with paternal affection, but we *command* them with all the authority in our power, to procure a truly Christian and Catholic education for their beloved offspring, given them by God, reborn to Christ in baptism, and destined for heaven, and

---

[147] *Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum collectio Lacensis* (Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1875), iii, col. 209. For further information on the educational legislation of the provincial councils of Cincinnati cf. Edward A. Connaughton, *A History of Educational Legislation and Administration in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (Washington, 1946).

[148] Official *Acta et decreta*, p. 280.

to defend and safeguard them from the dangers of an education merely secular during the entire period of childhood and youth; and therefore to send them to parochial schools or others truly Catholic, unless perchance the Ordinary, in a particular case should judge that it might be permitted otherwise.[149]

Due allowance, of course, was made in the fourth of the fundamental rules governing the whole educational legislation, in regard to those parents who for a sufficient cause did not send their children to the parish schools. It stated:

> Catholic parents are bound to send their children to parochial schools, unless either at home or in other Catholic schools they provide sufficiently for their Christian education, or unless it be lawful to send them to other schools on account of a sufficient reason, approved by the bishop, and with necessary precaution and remedies. But it is left to the judgment of the Ordinary to define what is a Catholic school.[150]

The solicitude of the fathers of the council in behalf of Catholic schools may be further seen in the legislation enacted by them concerning the teaching of catechism. Pastors and their assistants were urged to visit very often the catechism classes on Sunday, and on week days those of the parochial schools, as well as colleges, high schools, and academies of boys and girls not under the management of priests. Pastors were commanded to give assiduous attention to the little ones, especially at the time they were being prepared to receive their first communion. The pastors themselves, or their assistants, were requested to teach such children catechism three times each week for at least six weeks. Boys and girls after their first communion were to be taught for two years more thoroughly in Christian doctrine and morals. No one was to be admitted to confirmation who had not been instructed in what pertained to the nature and effects of this sacrament.[151]

The concern of the hierarchy for the Christian education of the Indian and Negro was evident from the decree which urged the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in every parish in which it had not yet been erected, and the ordering of a collec-

[149] *Ibid.*, decretum 196.

[150] *Ibid.*, decretum 199, I and IV.

[151] *Ibid.*, decreta, 217-218.

tion to be made yearly in all the dioceses for the foreign missions and missions among American Indians and Negroes. The council did not raise the delicate question of segregation in relation to the colored in Catholic schools and churches. They accepted the usual policy prevalent in the South of having separate schools and churches for the colored, and a separate section for them in the churches of the whites. The bishops felt that such aspects of the colored problem as segregation were an issue to be dealt with in provincial councils. Consequently, the Third Plenary Council advocated that special legislation be enacted in a provincial council for an area where there was a large colored population to provide better and more efficacious measures by which the Christian education of these people might be promoted.[152]

The Third Plenary Council was blessed with the presence of outstanding churchmen. Gibbons, Ireland, Gilmour, Ryan, Spalding, Keane, Corrigan, McQuaid, Kenrick and other *nomina clara et venerabilia* stated their views frankly with a view to promoting the best interests of the Church in the United States. In the sessions every member of the council was given opportunity to express his opinions freely without fear or embarrassment. The work accomplished by the church leaders regarding educational legislation has redounded to the honor and glory of the Catholic school system in this country. Nothing was overlooked by them in their efforts to raise the standards of Catholic schools. The decrees enacted contained in concise form all the fundamental principles of the Catholic philosophy of education. The fathers of the council recognized the necessity, not only of multiplying parish schools, but of increasing Catholic high schools, academies, and colleges as well, so that a complete system of Christian education would be afforded the Catholic youth of the land. A significant advance in higher education began with the appointment in the council of a committee for the purpose of instituting the means necessary for the establishment of a central Catholic university. By its decrees relating to the supervision of the schools by the pastor, the training of teachers in the normal schools of their novitiates and the certification of teachers, both religious and secular, the council laid

[152] *Ibid.*, decreta, 237-240.

the foundation for the future development in Catholic school organization and administration which is today the admiration of every fair-minded historian of American education. The work of the bishops in 1884 was so successfully done that the succeeding years have witnessed in good measure the fulfillment of their hope expressed in the determination to so raise the standards of the schools that Catholic education might become "the honor and ornament, the hope and strength of the Church and of the Republic."

The Catholic University of America

V.
194

MISCELLANY

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF ST. AELRED.

By

CARLETON M. SAGE*

In the twelfth century the new Cistercian movement spread rapidly over western Europe, and expressed much of what was best in the life and ideals of the age. Its conscious purpose was to abandon the developments of the Carolingian age and to return to the literal following of the Rule of St. Benedict. But in some ways it was an innovation in keeping with certain new monastic ideals of the eleventh and twelfth centuries which desired greater austerity and poverty and manual labor, a more complete separation from the secular world, and, at least from the time of St. Bernard and probably earlier, included a powerful current of mysticism. It drew into its ranks many of the best spirits of the twelfth century. In spite of a certain traditional disparagement of letters, many of them became notable writers, of whom St. Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx in Yorkshire, is the best-known Englishman.

Rievaulx was a daughter house of Clairvaux, whose temporal founder was one of the new Norman barons of the north country, and whose spiritual father was St. Bernard himself. While it was still in the pioneer state it was joined by the youthful Aelred, an Anglo-Saxon from Hexham but an official and friend of the King of Scotland. Special talents soon showed themselves, and the abbot employed him as novice master and on missions to magnates and once even to Rome. Aelred was elected abbot of his monastery in 1147, remaining so until his death twenty years later. Some who knew him have left us descriptions of his character, mentioning his practical wisdom and integrity, saying that he was witty and a good companion, generous and discreet; but it was his patience, gentleness, friendly kindness, and strong religious spirit that made the deepest impression. His early education had been limited; but he was intelligent and diligent, and after entering the monastery applied himself to good purpose.

St. Aelred's numerous writings are of two kinds, those which are directly ascetic, and those which in form are historical. But his purpose and interest are always religious, and the chief value of the historical works is as a second class of religious composition. All but one of his larger works, in so far as they have survived, have been printed, and that one, the *De anima*, is now being edited in England. But the major ones have not been re-edited from the manuscripts since their first appearance in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. In recent years there has been

*Father Sage is assistant professor of mediaeval history in the Catholic University of America.

some revival of interest in him and a number of studies has been published, but the need of a new edition is felt if thorough work is to be possible. The present writer has been hoping to make such an edition, and in preparation this list of manuscripts has been compiled. It is drawn from a large number of library catalogues and from such other printed materials as have been available; and some corrections and additions have kindly been made by correspondents in Europe. A beginning has been made in gathering and examining microfilms of the manuscripts. Where this list differs from those of T. D. Hardy, C. Hontoir, Manitius, and once even from Wilmart, it is because it follows what seems to be better information. Still, a list made without the actual examination of the manuscripts is likely to have defects; so the writer will appreciate information leading to any improvement.

The Catholic University of America

(Bibliographical note)

The bibliography on St. Aelred is extensive; the following are a selection from the recent titles. William M. Ducey has an article, based on his master's dissertation, "St. Ailred of Rievaulx and the Speculum caritatis," *Catholic Historical Review*, XVII(October, 1931), 308-317. The most important work for biography is F. M. Powicke, *Ailred of Rievaulx and his Biographer Walter Daniel* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1922, a corrected reprint from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, VI(1921-22)). C. Hontoir has the fullest treatment of the manuscripts, but limits himself to those of the ascetical works, *Collectanea Ordinis Cisterciensium Reformatorum*, I(1934-35), 242-251; II(1935-36), 122-124, 186-189, 247-250. A. Wilmart wrote several articles, the most recent of which is the posthumous "Un court traité d'Aelred sur l'étendue et le but de la profession monastique," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, XXIII(1947), 259-273. The *De spirituali amicitia* seems to be at present the most popular of Aelred's writings, and has appeared not only in French and German but in two English translations: Sister M. Eugenia Laker, "Sancti Aelredi De spirituali amicitia libri tres. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary," an unpublished doctoral dissertation at St. Louis University (1941); and Hugh Talbot, *Christian Friendship by St. Ailred of Rievaulx* (London, 1942). Perhaps the best recent reference article is A. Le Bail, "Aelred," *Dict. de spiritualité*, I, 225-234.

DE ONERIBUS

AVIGNON. Bibliothèque. MS. 232. 16th c. f.41(-65). Sermo I (PL.184: 817); others?

AVIGNON. Bibliothèque. MS. 349. 16th c. f.75(-81). Sermo I.

CAMBRAI. Bibl. MS. 362. 13th c. f.57(-133). used in R. Gibbon's edition.

CAMBRIDGE. Jesus Coll. MS. 24 (Q. B. 7). 14th c. f.75(-111), (from Durham).
CAMBRIDGE. St. John's Coll. MS. 140. 13th c. f.174-178, (from Bury).
DOUAI. Bibl. MS. 49. 13th c. f.91-92, (from Marchiennes).
DURHAM UNIVERSITY LIBRARY. MS. Cosin V. II. 2. 12th c. from Durham.
ERLANGEN. Universitätsbibl. Hs. 62. 13th c. entire 142 fols. (from Heilsbronn).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 2 D xxxii. 13th c. f.3(-138), (from Ch. Ch., Canterbury).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 5 B ix. 13th c. f.43(-137), (from Coggeshall).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 488. 13th c. f.106(-118), (from Buildwas).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 139(1909). 12th c. f.1(-123).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 197(1906). 12th c. f.1(-103), (from Reading).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 76. 12th c. entire 119 fols.
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 648. 13th c. entire 63 fols.
PARIS. Bibl. Mazarine. MS. 998. 12th c. f.1(-116).
PARIS. Bibl. Nat. MS. lat. 491. 13th c. f.1-98, (from Foucarmont).
PARIS. Bibl. Nat. MS. lat. 17,467. 12th c. f.1-69, (from S. Martin des Champs).
ROUEN. Bibl. MS. 546. 13th c. f.1(-114), (from Jumièges).
ROUEN Bibl. MS. 547. 13th c. f.1(-105), (from Fécamp).
S. OMER. Bibl. MS. 94. 13th c. article 6.
TROYES. Bibl. MS. 1045. 12-13th c. entire 96 fols., (from Clairvaux).
VALENCIENNES. Bibl. MS. 516. 12-13th c. f.38(-40), (from S. Amand).

HOMILIAE DE TEMPORE ET DE SANCTIS

DURHAM UNIV. LIBR. MS. Cosin V. I. 11. early 13th c.
ETON COLL. MS. 38.
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 497. 12-13th c. mingled with Bernard (from Reading).
OXFORD. Jesus Coll. MS. 6. 12th c. mingled with others.
TROYES. Bibl. MS. 910. 12th c. article 1 (from Clairvaux), printed Tissier and Migne's Patrologia.
(DURHAM CATHEDRAL. MS. B. 2. 31. 14th c., sometimes cited for these homilies, seems from the catalogue to have only *De Jesu puero* of Aelred.)

SERMO DE DILECTIONE DEI.

DOUAI. Bibl. MS. 396. 15th c. f.176-177 (from Sheen Charterhouse).

DE JESU PUERO DUODENNI.

BOLOGNA. Bibl. Communale. MS. A.157. 15th c. f.127-133.
DOUAI. Bibl. MS. 392. 13th c. f.63(-73) (from Anchin), used by R. Gibbon.
DURHAM CATHEDRAL. MS. B. 2. 31. 14th c. f.55(-60), (from Durham Priory).
DURHAM UNIV. LIBR. MS. Cosin V. I. 11. early 13th c.
FLORENCE. Bibl. Laurenziana. MS. Plut. xvi, cod. i. 15th c. p. 287(-296).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 5 A xii. 15th c. f.152(-163) (from Hailes).
MUNICH. Bayer. Staatsbibl. Clm. 2689. 14th c. f.29(-36), (from Aldersbach).
PARIS. Arsenal. MS. 550. 13th c. f.28(-31), (from Augustinians of Paris).
PARIS. Bibl. Nat. MS. nouv. acq. lat. 217. 13th c. p. 141(-154), (from Savigny).
PARIS. Bibl. Ste. Geneviève. MS. 1199. 13th c. f.90(-95).
UTRECHT. Rijksuniversiteit. MS. 205. 15th c. f.228-242.

DE SPIRITUALI AMICITIA

BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 203. 14th c. p. 389-429. (from Aulne).
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 1384. 13th c. f.54-94. (from Cambron).
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 1487. 15th c. f.120-135 (? or, Speculum caritatis).
CAMBRAI. Bibl. MS. 275. 13th c. f.129-184, used by R. Gibbon.
CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 424. 13th c. vol. 6, no. 13. 11 fols., a compilation.
CAMBRIDGE. Trinity Coll. MS. 912 (R. 14. 40). 13th c. pt. 6, p. 347(-356).
CAMBRIDGE. Univ. Libr. MS. Ii. VI. 39. 14th c. f.156-160.
DUBLIN. Trinity Coll. MS. 432. 13-15th c. (towards end).
DUBLIN. Trinity Coll. MS. 514. 14-15th c. (tenth title).
EDINBURGH. Univ. Libr. MS. 89 (D. b. IV. 17). 14th c. f.89^{v}-90.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 5 B ix. 13th c. f.137(-159), (from Coggeshall).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 8 F i. c.1200. f.4(-17), (from Revesby).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 10 C iii. 13th c. f.78(-81), (from Reading).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 431. f.32(-47), (from Lanthony) (Speculum spiritualis amicitie)
MUNICH. Bayer. Staatsbibl. Clm. 1375. 16-18th c., last article.
NAMUR. Bibl. Musée Archéol. Cod. 14. 13-14th c. f.320 (from Floreffe).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 139(1909). 12th c. f.123-150.
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 197(1906). 12th c. f.103(-126), (from Reading).

V.
194

OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Digby 190. 14-15th c. f.54(-66), (from Merton Coll.).
S. OMER. Bibl. MS. 86. 13th c. article 3, (from Clairmarais), used by R. Gibbon.
TROYES. Bibl. MS. 398. 13th c. article 2, (from Clairvaux).
VALENCIENNES. Bibl. MS. 516. 12-13th c. f.2(-13), (from S. Amand).

SPECULUM CARITATIS

BASEL. Bibl. der Universität. MS. B. ix. 33, the whole MS (acc. to Haenel).
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 1213. 15th c. f.2-90.
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 1448. 13th c. f.1-86.
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 1487. 15th c. f.120-135 (? or, De spirit. amicitia).
CAMBRAI. Bibl. MS. 211. 12-13th c. f.1(-65).
CAMBRIDGE. St. John's Coll. MS.77. 12th c. f.1-91. (from Buildwas).
DOUAI. Bibl. MS. 392. 13th c. f.1(-63), (from Anchin), used by R. Gibbon.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 5 B ix. 13th c. f.159-211, (from Coggeshall).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 397. 12th c. f.1-103. (from Lanthony).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 431. f.32 (-47). (from Lanthony) (Speculum spiritualis amicitie).
MUNICH. Bayer. Staatsbibl. Clm. 1375. 16-18th c., next to last article.
NAMUR. Bibl. Musée Archéol. Cod. 163. 1469 A.D. f.57-83 (from Jardinet).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Ashmole 1285. c. 1300. f.236-269 (from Southwark).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Digby 218. 13-14th c. f.70(-82).
PARIS. Arsenal. MS. 550. 13th c. f.50(-101) (from Austin Friars of Paris).
PARIS. Bibl. Nat. MS. lat. 16,339. 13th c. f.69-105 (from the Sorbonne).
PARIS. Bibl. Nat. MS. lat. 17,468. 12th c. f.1-52 (from S. Martin des Champs).
S. GALL. Stiftsbibl. MS. 680. 15-16th c. p. 266-.
WOODCHESTER. (Glos.) Dominican Priory.

COMPENDIUM SPECULI CARITATIS

BERN. Stadtbibl. MS. A.94. 12th c. pt. 2, f.1-6.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 7 D xvii. 13-15th c. f.229(-233) (from Sheen).
MONS. Bibl. MS. 239 (36/361). 13th c. f.1(-15) (from Cambron).

PARIS. Bibl. Mazarine. MS. 944. 15th c. f.172(-200) (perhaps from Louvain).
S. OMER. Bibl. MS. 86. 13th c. article 2, (from Clairmarais), used by R. Gibbon.
TROYES. Bibl. MS. 1838. 12th c. article 3 (from Clairvaux).

VITA S. EDWARDI

AVRANCHES. Bibl. MS. 167. 13th c. f.81-. (from Mont Saint Michel).
BERN. Stadtbibl. MS. 568. 12th c. f.83-120.
BRUSSELS. Bibl. Royale. MS. 3234. 16th c. f.156-161.
CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 161. 12-13th c. f.108(-138).
CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 318. 12th c. f.1(-140), (from Rochester).
CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 404. 14th c.? f.96 (from Bury).
DUBLIN. Trinity Coll. MS. 172. 13-14th c. article 2, (from Westminster).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 35,110. 12th c. f.153(-186), (from Newcastle).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Arundel 63. 13th c. f.1(-25).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Cotton MS. Otho A vi. article 4, badly burned.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Cotton MS. Vespasian B xi. 15th c. f.81(-106).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Cotton MS. Vitellius C xii. f.236(-255).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Cotton MS. Vitellius F iii. article 1, (from Rievaulx), burned.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 200. 14-15th c. f.162 to end.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 322. f.9(-38).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 563. f. or p.121(-125), written by John Stow.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 4976. 14th c., entire MS.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 6 B ix. 15th c. f.178-198.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Stowe 104. 12-13th c. f.118(-149).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 138. f.179(-205).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 331. 13-14th c. f.118-157 (from Peterborough ?).
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 761. 13th c. entire 70 fols. (from Westminster and Pershore).
LONDON. Mr. Francis Wormald (formerly Mostyn). 12th c. article 1.
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 285(2430). 13th c. f.58(-80), (from Ramsey ?).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Digby 59. 12th c. f.92(-144).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 668. 12-13th c. f.1(-38), (from Yorkshire).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Selden supra 55(3443). 15th c. entire 26 fols., verse adaptation.

OXFORD. St. John's Coll. MS. 149. 12-13th c. f.1(-60).
WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL. MS. xiii (IV. 2). 12th c. f.50-80.

DE GENEALOGIA REGUM.

CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 101. 16th c. f.117(-132).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 35,110. 12th c. f.186-187 (from Austin Friars, Newcastle).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 37,223. 15th c. f.117(-125). Scottish adaptation.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Arundel 161. 13-14th c. f.133(-146).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Cleopatra B iii. 15th c. f.2(-36).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Julius A xi. 14th c. f.1(-23), (from Byland).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Otho D vii. article 8.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vespasian A xviii. f.68(-83).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vespasian B xi. 15th c. f.106(-126).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vitellius F iii. article 2 (from Rievaulx), damaged.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 3846. 15th c. f.71-103.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 13 D i. c.1385. f.222(-225), (from S. Peter's Cornhill).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 13 D v. 13th c. f.142(-152), (from St. Alban's).
LONDON. Mr. Francis Wormald (formerly Mostyn), 12th c. article 2.
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Digby 19. 12th c. f.1-71, owned by 14th c. bps., then Merton.
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 668. 12-13th c. f.38(-62), (from Yorkshire).
OXFORD. University Coll. MS. 44. 17th c. entire MS.
POITIERS. Bibl. MS. 75. 12th c. f.70(-92), (from la Merci-Dieu).
STONYHURST COLL. MS. 35. 17th c. f.63-64, passages imbedded in another work.

DE INSTITUTIS INCLUSARUM

HEREFORD CATHEDRAL. MS. P. I. xvii. 12-13th c. f.104(-111), (from Cirencester).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Nero A iii. 12th c. f.1(-42).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vitellius E vii. article 4 (from Bardney), damaged.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 8 D iii. 13th c. f.166(-169), (from Ramsey).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 36(1888). 13th c. f.70(-78) (from Caermarthen).

(OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Bodley 423(2322). 15th c. f.178(-192). English translation).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Digby 218. 13-14th c. f.83(-91).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Hatton 101(4048). 13th c. p.412(-420), extract (from Holm Cultram).
PARIS. Université. MS. 790. 14th c. f.1(-23), (from Whalley Abbey, and Oxford).
UTRECHT. Rijksuniversiteit. MS. 104. 14th c. f.38-73, (from Dutch Charterhouse).

DE ANIMA

CAMBRIDGE. Jesus Coll. MS. 59 (Q. G. 11). 15th c. f.147(-149), (from Durham).
CAMBRIDGE. Pembroke Coll. MS. 205. 17th c. entire 62 pp.
DURHAM CATHEDRAL. MS. B. iv. 25. f.83-128. 12th c. (from Durham Priory).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne 209. 17th c. f.2(-35).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. e Mus. 224(3542). c. 1200, entire 62 pp.

DE SANCTIS ECCLESIAE HAGUSTALDENSIS.

LONDON. Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 38,816. 12th c. f.1(-18), (from S. Mary's, York).
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vitellius F iii. article 4, (from Rievaulx).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 668. 12-13th c. f.62(-78), (from Yorkshire).

VITA S. NINIANI.

LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Tiberius D iii. 13th c. f.186-192, damaged.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Vitellius F iii. article 3 (from Rievaulx).
OXFORD. Bodleian. MS. Laud. misc. 668. 12-13th c. f.78(-89), (from Yorkshire).

DE BELLO STANDARDI

CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 139. 12th c. f.136(-149), used by Twysden.
LONDON. Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton Titus A xix. 15th c. within f.144-150.
YORK MINSTER. MS. xvi. I. 8. 12th c. f.9- (from Rievaulx), followed by R. Howlett.

ORATIO PASTORALIS.

CAMBRIDGE. Jesus Coll. MS. 34 (Q. B. 17). 12-13th c. f.97-99 (from Rievaulx), printed by Wilmart.

DE SANCTIMONIALI WATTUN.

CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 139. 12th c. f.149-152 (from Hexham?).

RITHMUS DE LAUDE VIRGINITATIS.

DOUAI. Bibl. MS. 392. 13th c. f.94-98 (from Anchin), used by R. Gibbon.

DE XII ABUSIONIBUS CLAUSTRALIUM

LONDON. Brit. Mus. Cotton MS. Cleopatra B vi. f.187(-201).

SPECULUM HUMILITATIS

CAMBRIDGE. C.C.C. MS. 424, pt. vi.
LONDON. Lambeth. MS. 431. f.47(-50), (from Lanthony).

ON THE PSALM "AFFERTE"

VALENCIENNES. Bibl. MS. 516. 12-13th c. f.29(-38), (from S. Amand).

A correspondent has called attention to certain MSS. of *De spirituali amicitia* and *Speculum caritatis*. A colophon in Cambridge C.C.C. MS. 424 says that Thomas de Frakaham, canon of Lesnes, made this compilation from the two works of Aelred, giving it the title "Speculum spiritualis amicitiae". This seems to be the same work as that given in Lambeth MS. 431, and may also be that in Trinity College Dublin MS. 514, and also in St. John's College Oxford MS. 190.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

L'Église au pouvoir des laiques, 888-1057. By Émile Amann and Auguste Dumas. [Histoire de l'Église, publiée sous la direction de Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin, Vol. 7.] (Paris: Bloud and Gay. 1948. Pp. 544. 450 frs.)

It was in 1940 that this work first took its place as the seventh volume in the collection *Histoire de l'église* edited by Professor Fliche and the late Monsignor Martin. Now, after the eighth, the ninth, and the seventeenth volumes have been added to the series (the seventeenth—L. Cristiani's *L'Église à l'époque du concile de Trente*—appeared in the spring of 1948), this present study is reissued in a slightly revised edition.

Twelve of its eighteen chapters are from the pen of M. Dumas, the others are due to the late Monsignor Amann. In general, sufficient space is assigned matters of narrative history. The vicissitudes of the papacy from the days of Formosus down to those of Victor II are well recounted and a description is provided of the years of tension between Rome and Constantinople which led at length to the schism of Michael Caerularius. There is a consistent effort made to point out evidences of papal religious concern in the midst of political maneuverings.

But the emphasis of the book is actually upon other topics. Some 380 of its pages are given over to institutional and social subjects. Thus there are chapters describing the make-up of the Roman court, the organization of ecclesiastical provinces, methods of filling bishoprics, and the functioning of the parish system. There is, furthermore, a detailed discussion of the state of monasticism and a survey on the expansion of the Church throughout Europe. Particularly good are the fifty pages devoted to a synthesis of moral and religious conditions among Christians and the chapter on intellectual and artistic movements which concludes the book. The reader will no doubt be struck by the fact that liturgical and sacramental practices go undescribed. This omission is all the more regrettable since the preceding volume in the collection—Amann's *L'Époque carolingienne*—set aside but a scant half-dozen pages on penitential discipline.

Throughout, the handling is scholarly and competent. The exposition is based directly upon the relative sources and there is adequate use made of modern studies. True, the bibliographical references are not normally exhaustive, but that is rather a characteristic of the collection than a peculiarity of this volume. Seemingly the editors of the series never meant

to dispense their readers from the need of recurring to Karl Bihlmeyer's *Kirchengeschichte* for fuller listings upon individual topics.

It is from comparison with the 1942 reprint of this work, which the reviewer happens to have at hand, rather than from any indication given by the publisher in this present copy that the 1948 issue of Amann-Dumas is seen to be a partial revision of the original text. New references have been incorporated into some of the footnotes which has entailed, here and there, the resetting of a page. But several important late studies have unfortunately been missed. Thus, Martin Jugie's *Le schism byzantin: aperçu historique et doctrinal* (Paris, 1941) should have been noticed in Amann's chapter on Rome and Constantinople just as the first two volumes of Dom Philibert Schmitz' monumental *Histoire de l'ordre de saint Benoit* (Maredsous, 1942; 2nd edition, 1947) should have been listed in Dumas' treatment of the monasteries. Subsequent revisions will have to show greater concern about keeping a significant study abreast of scholarly output.

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, New Jersey

L'Église à l'époque du concile de Trente. By L. Cristiani. [Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours, publiée sous la direction d'Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin, Vol. 17] (Paris: Bloud and Gay. 1948. Pp. 495. 480 frs.)

The appearance of a new volume in the monumental History of the Church which has, amid great and intelligible difficulties, been slowly coming forth under the direction of Augustin Fliche and the late Monsignori Martin and Amann, is in itself something of an historical event. The more so when it proceeds from the pen of so distinguished a scholar as Canon Léon Cristiani, now honorary dean of the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic Institute of Lyons, who already has forty-years of fruitful activity behind him.

The present volume is divided into two parts of almost equal length. The first deals with the Council of Trent: its long preparation, its various sessions, resumptions, discussions, crises, decisions. The second part, surveying the principal countries of Catholic Europe, depicts the reformation spontaneously effected by the saints of the period, the founders of new orders, the renovators of the older religious communities, without which the official reformation attempted by the Council of Trent would have had no chance of success. In general, the subject is the magnificent revival of Catholic life, fervor, discipline, and activity between the years 1517 and 1563 (the Protestant movements of the time being left to another volume of the series).

To find much that is new to say in reviewing a field with which a Pastor has already dealt, is not easy. Yet Canon Cristiani has succeeded. While usually agreeing with Pastor as to facts, he supplements the latter by his constant citation of original sources, his utilization of the latest historical literature, and by many new points of view. It would be hard to find elsewhere a stronger presentation of the reasons why the most fruitful religious movement of that time should be called, not "the Counter-Reformation," but "the Catholic Reformation" (as a movement not only anterior to, but growing up, in the main, quite independently of, the Protestant Revolt); or a clearer analysis of the work done by the Council of Trent; or more vivid pen-pictures of the great Catholic figures of the time; or a finer appreciation of the spirituality of a St. Cajetan, a St. Ignatius of Loyola, a St. Philip Neri, a St. Teresa (here the author is most particularly in his own domain).

Amid so much that is excellent, a few blemishes may be noted. A certain carelessness as to the exact rendition of foreign names is but too common with French scholars; and here one encounters "Lippomani" for Lippomano (p. 119), "Batista" for Battista (p. 250), "Schlachta" for Szlachta (p. 351), "Dembiuski" for Dembiński (p. 351, note 2), "Phauser" for Pfauser (p. 342), or "Bayados" for Badajoz (p. 449). Some dates have gone awry, perhaps simply through printers' errors. Thus one finds "1521" for 1523, as the date of Chieregati's declaration to the Diet of Nuremberg (p. 21); "1553" for 1555 as the date of the Peace of Augsburg (p. 140); "1526" for 1536 as the year when St. Teresa entered the monastery of Avila (p. 456).

The author appears to believe that Veszprém is in Poland (p. 352). It is surprising to find him declaring that the English Seminary was founded at Rome in 1556 by Cardinal Pole (p. 210), and that Pius IV completed the establishment of the Roman Seminary in 1563 (p. 210). It would be highly interesting if Canon Cristiani were right in his contention that the Oratory of the Divine Love at Rome was approved by a bull of Leo X of March 23, 1514, for this would carry the genesis of this famous group of Catholic reformers back two or three years before the first date that Pastor could fix for it and at least three and a half years before Luther began his movement. But it seems clear that here the author has misunderstood his source (P. Tacchi-Venturi, S.J.), and that the bull of 1514 confirmed, not the Roman oratory, but the Genoese society of the same name (p. 248 and note 5).

It may be regretted that this volume says nothing about Catholicism in England, Scotland, Ireland, the Netherlands, or Hungary, and says very little about the social action of the Church, her influence upon charity, education, learning, literature, or art.

ROBERT H. LORD
St. Paul's Church
Wellesley, Massachusetts

La monarchie française et la provision des bénéfices ecclésiastiques en Alsace. By René Metz. (Strasbourg: F. X. Le Roux et Cie. 1947. Pp. 435.)

To free the Church from the baneful effects of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges Pope Leo X joined with Francis I in signing the French concordat of 1516. To the French sovereign this document granted the right of nomination to all bishoprics, abbeys, and priories in his realm. By virtue of this concession, the most sweeping ever given to any state, France remained a Catholic nation throughout the wars of religion. But it was too high a price to pay because Catholicism suffered disastrously from the political appointments which followed.

In 1648 the Peace of Westphalia ceded Upper and Lower Alsace to France and the *Ancien Régime* faced a thorny political problem. These new territories were predominantly German and there was urgent need to absorb them into France. Astutely Louis XIV decided against a display of force and in favor of cultivating the friendship of the clergy who exercised great influence over the faithful. Accordingly, the clergy were allowed the same rights which they had enjoyed under the Austrian Empire. By and large these privileges were those guaranteed by the German concordat of 1448 signed by Nicholas V, Emperor Frederick III, and the German princes. Foremost among these prerogatives was the right to free elections and thus the German concordat may be regarded as the antithesis to the French concordat.

The whole history of benefices in Alsace from the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution is the subject of this scholarly book. Wisely the study has been divided into two parts. First, the author has unearthed all the available information about Alsatian benefices from exhaustive research into French, German, Swiss, and Vatican archives and from printed records. He treats not only sees, but abbeys of both men and women; chapters, regular and secular; curacies, chaplaincies, and other simple benefices. Hence, this is not merely a general survey or a disquisition into the canonical aspect of benefices; it is the definitive account from the sources.

In general it may be said that elections were free. The freedom of the elections was guaranteed by three commissioners who represented the crown. After the election the king granted the letters patent for the possession of the benefice. In these letters he made a direct appointment, deliberately ignoring the fact of the election yet always appointing the one elected. Although the French nobility professed to be most solicitous for the Church's welfare, more than once they endeavored to force commendatory abbots upon Alsatian monasteries. Happily in most instances their efforts were unsuccessful.

The second half of this volume is devoted to a candid evaluation of the royal policy from the political viewpoint. According to this norm it was eminently successful because Alsace soon became an integral part of France. Loyalty to France was characteristic of those holding Alsatian benefices. Seminaries were established for the formation of a native clergy and foreigners were gradually excluded. Subtle artifices, such as the appointment of coadjutor bishops in Strasbourg, were sometimes employed to control elections which remained technically free. But for the most part the privileges of the German concordat were respected and the Catholic religion continued to be a vital influence among the Alsatians who now owed allegiance to France.

For those who specialize in benefices or in modern French and Alsatian history this book will be doubly rewarding because it combines exacting research with urbanity of style and a wealth of interesting information.

HARRY C. KOENIG

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary
Mundelein

Missionnaires belges sous l'ancien régime (1500-1800) by Joseph Masson, S. J. (Bruxelles: l'Édition Universelle, S. A.; Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer & Cie. 1947. Pp. 183. 75 frs. belges.)

The sub-title of this first of a series of biographical studies about Belgian missionaries, "Ceux qui versèrent leur sang," gives us a clearer view of the nature of Father Masson's work. His book is, indeed, a *florilegium martyrum*, a golden book about the blood witnesses who died for the extension of the reign of Christ in mission countries.

The stage on which the several dramas of martyrdom are accomplished, of which Father Masson's personalities are the main actors, were: the Marianas and Palaos Islands, the mission territories of Japan and China, the Congo, and finally North and South America. In writing his work Father Masson imposed on himself a chronological restriction, viz., the missionaries whose lives he writes lived in the period between the Renaissance and the French Revolution. These three centuries were, for the sake of the missions, a time of extensive expansion. With the Renaissance started a new period of intellectual curiosity. This reflected itself in a desire for discovery which opened new fields for missionary activity.

An important number of the sons of that part of the Netherlands that we call Belgium eternalized their memories among the missionaries of this period. However, Father Masson's work does not treat exclusively of missionaries born in the Belgium of our days, in Flanders, Wallonia, and the territory once ruled by the Prince Bishop of Liége. Members of the Belgian provinces of the great missionary orders, even if they were not born in the Belgian territory, are considered as Belgian missionaries.

What Father Masson tells about their lives and activities is important for more than one reason: the memory of several of the missionaries whose lives he writes, was quite blurred at this time. His book not only brings their achievements back in our appreciation, but by the numerous details he gives about them, they assume more than ever the place in the history of the missions which their achievements deserved. By reviving their memories Masson is anxious to show his heroes in the local setting to give the full perspective of their missionary activities.

Interesting details, for the most part derived from original sources, familiarize us with the work they performed as well as with the typical mentality that animated every missionary of the early days. Where today every missionary considers a lifelong achievement as an appreciable goal of his existence, it was the highest dream of the missionaries in the early days to give their blood for Christ and finish their lives as martyrs. Most of Father Masson's heroes saw their dream fulfilled. It is often about this bloody end of their lives that we lack documents.

The similarity of the matter of Masson's book presents the danger of a certain monotony. However, the colorful way in which he presents his biographies makes this inconvenience a minor defect. His work is a welcome contribution to the history of the missions in general. Certain chapters, where he treats of North and South America and their possessions, e.g., the Marianas and the Palaos, are of a more special interest for our mission histories because of American acquaintance there since World War II.

WILLIAM J. PRICE

St. Thomas Aquinas Cathedral
Reno

Young Mr. Newman. By Maisie Ward. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1948. Pp. xvii, 477. $4.50.)

Too many biographers of John Henry Newman have ignored his early life, or handled it inadequately. So shattering has been the impact upon history of the decisions of his middle years that even normal curiosity has failed in concern for the story of his boyhood and his youth. Maisie Ward calls into play her characteristic industry and zeal in a successful effort to remedy this defect. To this end she has quoted numerous documents previously unavailable and all of lasting value.

There is the Newman family life, with John taking more than his share of the financial burdens. He loved to act and to make speeches, and, musical like the others, was proficient on the violin. Such amusements were anathema to stern religionists, which is one of the reasons why the author discards the legend that the Newmans were calvinistically inclined. They were really "moderate churchmen," not even consistently evan-

gelical. The latter tradition, reaching the boy through reading, gave him his conviction of inward conversion and helped impart to him his later certainty of "two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator." Concerning this evangelical influence, Maisie Ward draws significant comparisons between the careers of Newman and Wesley, both of whom "started inside the Church of England movements that were to end outside it."

As an Oxford student, Newman described himself as having "more proper sense of religion than them all together;" but he was anti-Catholic. In collaboration with a friend he wrote verses on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew in the most deplorable tradition of both poetry and history. Later he worked to defeat Peel and, with him, the cause of Catholic Emancipation. "The willingness of Catholics to consort with 'such vile persons' as O'Connell," who, in turn was collaborating with liberals, was, in the opinion of Maisie Ward, "a major stumbling block in Newman's path."

A significant chapter tells the story of his travels, including his illness in Sicily, when intuitive knowledge came to him that important work awaited him in England. Of special value to the student of social history is a section on "The World to be Moved." Then from Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy" stemmed the Oxford Movement, with momentous consequences for men and causes. Its summary in this book makes fascinating reading.

True, however, to her intention to give the reader a clearer picture of Newman, the man, previous to his conversion, she tells us gracious things about his human relationships. He was devoted to his kinsfolk and possessed a genius for friendship. The many distinguished members of the Wilberforce family live again in these pages. To her famous grandfather, William George Ward, Mrs. Sheed devotes a delightful chapter of refreshing objectivity and absorbing interest.

In these sad days of apostasy and schism under terror in the East, let us pray that the lesson of Chalcedon, which meant so much to Newman, may again take on meaning for seekers after that unity for which Christ prayed so fervently the night before He died. This latest book by Maisie Ward has put us further in her debt. A joy to the general reader, a treasure for the scholar, it should have wide appeal.

GEORGIANA P. MCENTEE

Hunter College

L'église de France et la révolution de 1848. By Jean Leflon. (Paris: Bloud & Gay. 1948. Pp. 134. 120 frs.)

Since the year 1948 marks the centennial of that epidemic of political upheavals which spread across the European continent a century ago, there

recently has come off the press a number of historical studies related to the revolutions occasioned by the liberalism and nationalism of the mid-nineteenth century. Jean Leflon's brief but stimulating study of the position of the Catholic Church in the French revolution of 1848 is one of these works.

The revolution in France in 1848 was unique in two respects. First, it was social and economic as much as it was political in character; secondly, it was not anti-clerical. The refusal of the bourgeois monarchy to grant the demands of the Church in the field of education as well as the lack of clerical sympathy for the Orleans dynasty, whatever was its cause, explains in large part why the revolution of 1848 found a ready ally in the Church. Lacordaire's oratory at Notre Dame, Monseigneur Affre's co-operation with the provisional government, and Pius XI's letter to Montalembert are witnesses to the Church's easy acceptance of the changes effected in France. Various circumstances combine to explain why the Church was willing to see the break in the alliance between the throne and the altar. But among the factors which do explain the attitude of the leaders in the Church, lay and cleric, the hostility toward economic liberalism has a prominent place. If the lamented apostate, Lamennais, and *l'Avenir* attempted a conciliation between the Church and the new liberal State, there was only opposition for the evils which attended the new industrial capitalism. DeBonald, DeMaistre, and Ozanam among the laity, and Donnet, Affre, and Parisis among the bishops, these are a few who were alert to the evils of an economy which operated according to the "iron law of supply and demand." Generally speaking in the spring of 1848 there was a unity, even though not much more than surface-deep, among the clergy in their support for the republic. A few no doubt were motivated by their attachment to the Bourbons. Many more supported the revolution because they were aware that Louis Philippe's ministers, Guizot and Thiers, promoted a system which was essentially not Christian.

However, the tragic consequences of the June insurrections, in which Archbishop Affre of Paris lost his life attempting to quell the revolt against the government, caused the clergy to reverse their position. Unfortunately, leaders in the Church in France failed to discriminate between political and economic liberalism, and so were blind to the distinction between the abuses of a system and the system itself. Lacordaire and Montalembert grew definitely cool toward the republic. The Catholic papers, *l'Univers* and *l'Ami de la religion,* once again fostered reaction. Only the Catholic daily, *l'Ere nouvelle,* and the stalwart Frédéric Ozanam withstood the almost universal reversal of the Catholic position. *L'Ere nouvelle* and Ozanam supported Cavaignac in the presidential campaign. The rest, aroused by the excesses of the June insurrections and fearful of a recurrence of the terrors of 1792-1794, cast their lot with the "party of order"

under the deceptive leadership of Prince Louis Napoleon. In stepping aside from its original position the Church in France made the mistake of "throwing out the baby with the bath," and contributed to the impression eagerly assumed by the enemies of the Church that Bonaparte drew his power from ecclesiastical sources. According to Leflon, who is a member of the faculty of the Catholic Institute of Paris, the reversal of the Church's position was tragic because from it resulted what Pius XI called "the great scandal of the century"—the alienation of the working classes from the Church.

HENRY W. CASPER

The Creighton University

The Church and Freemasonry in Brazil, 1872-1875: A Study in Regalism. By Sister Mary Crescentia Thornton, B.V.M. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. viii, 287. $3.00.)

Sister Mary Crescentia Thornton in the dissertation under review has made a fine contribution to our understanding of Brazil's past and present regarding matters of religion. She has also shed light upon the ambitions and secularist policies of governments of the nineteenth century and upon the machinations of Latin Masonry. In calm and scientific fashion this book unfolds the spirit and activities of nineteenth-century "liberalism" both in Europe and in Brazil. The chapters which lead up to the main topic, the crisis of 1872-1875, offer very clearly to the modern reader the reasons for the decadence of the Brazilian clergy from which the Brazilian Church in the mid-twentieth century is still seriously suffering. The author speaks, e. g., of "the intellectual prostitution of the clergy" (p. 45) while their moral decadence stands out prominently from the whole record. As usual, the responsibility of the condition is divided, but secularism, "liberalism," and, Masonry must carry a heavy share of it. Quotations from Brazilian (and Catholic) authors are particularly apposite. Here is one from the pen of Father Júlio Maria: "If we compare the small and sickly progress of the Brazilian church . . . with the rapid and prodigious development of that [Church] in the United States in one third of the same time, we cannot fail to attribute the causes to two phenomena: in the United States to the intrepidity of the episcopacy, to the activity of the clergy, to the freedom which the Church enjoys; in Brazil to Gallicanism, to regalism, and to the servitude of the Church in a regime of false union." In the narrative of the beginning of the crisis of 1872 we have an excellent use of sources, because the correspondence here given between Dom Vital, Bishop of Olinda in Recife, and his friend and kinsman, the councilor of state, João Alfredo Côrrea y Oliveira (whom fate threw on opposite sides of the quarrel), is enlightening in the extreme.

In the end it is seen that in this matter the regalistic government of Dom Pedro II was digging its own grave.

There is one criticism this reviewer has to offer. The attitude, not entirely scientific, seems to be classical with most Catholic historians that the papacy can do no wrong and has never made mistakes. Whereas statesmen, churchmen, "liberals," secularists, Masons, the clergy all come for their just share of criticism in this book, the impression given is that the papacy had always been and in practically every detail a paragon of wisdom. Of course, history's record tells us otherwise and this should have been brought out. In view of following developments it was a mistake for earlier popes—Calixtus III, Nicholas V, Sixtus IV, and Leo X—to have granted the privilege of ecclesiastical patronage. Give a king an inch and he'll take a mile. Nothing is said of the reactionary policies of Pius IX which exacerbated the spirit of "liberals" and drove them to further extremes. The rise of the papacy's modern prestige began with his successor, Leo XIII.

PETER MASTEN DUNNE

University of San Francisco

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Organized Religion in the United States. Edited by Ray H. Abrams, Vol. 256, *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science. March, 1948.* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1948. Pp. vii, 265. $2.00.)

This study of organized religion in the United States belies its title since much of its content and many of its contributors do not belong to organized religion. Probably those who planned the volume had only the kindliest feelings towards organized religion and sought an outside and impartial examination of the differing—if not conflicting—institutions of religion in this country. Whether such a study is possible is open to queston since the essential note of obligatory religion is that God, and not man, decides the essential nature of the religious obligation and the manner of its fulfillment. Several of these essays do not recognize this concept as valid. The essay on "Religion and Science in Conflict" with its deification of man, besides containing much unscientific loose talk, is plainly atheistic.

The first essay by J. O. Hertzler would reduce religion to subjective cultural phenomenon in which the differences of belief are the whole reality, not a manifestation of a deep and essential relationship. Hertzler seems to imply that freedom lies in the elimination of any sense of obligation. The other essays, even that of John Courtney Murray, are vitiated by this undenied assertion, and the manifestations of opposition of religious bodies to state control and the conflict of religious bodies with each other are

consequently pictured in an unattractive way. Garrison in his essay manifests his current antagonism towards Catholicism and misinterprets by anachronism the ten percent membership in the churches in 1790. Abrams' essay on the churches and World War II is interesting but wholly inadequate. The best effort is that of John Herman Randall, Jr., on "The Churches and the Liberal Tradition," especially where he stresses—what most of the other writers miss—the need of a recognition of the supernatural, independent character in man, if man is to retain his freedom in this atomic age. The bibliography is seriously deficient and contains a number of typographical errors.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY

University of Notre Dame

The American Churches. An Interpretation. By William Warren Sweet. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1948. Pp. 153. $1.50.)

The avowed purpose of this slender volume is to identify the principal factors which have made organized religion in America what it is today. The word "American" in the title is to be understood in its restricted sense as designating only the United States. The chapters of this work were originally prepared for the Beckly lectureship in England which Professor Sweet was the first citizen of the United States to hold. The Beckly Trust requires that there be a lecture dealing with the social implication of the Gospel. To fulfill this stipulation the author endeavored "to explain the underlying causes which have made the typically American Protestant churches so exceptionally socially-minded" (p. 8).

This brochure has several stimulating passages and is especially enlightening when treating the Protestant sects. The chapters on "Left-Wing Protestantism Triumphs in Colonial America" and "Revivalism in American Protestantism" are unusually well done. However, there are some statements even here which the critical reader might be slow to accept, e.g., "All the great concepts for which American democracy stands today, individual rights, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, self-government, and complete religious liberty, are concepts coming out of the left-wing phase of the Reformation" (p. 15).

Instead of maintaining that "the embodiment of the great principles of religious freedom in the new state constitutions, and finally in the Federal constitution was simply translating an overwhelming public opinion and colonial experience into the fundamental law of the land" (p. 31), it might have been well to add the constraining factor that no single church in the infant republic was sufficiently strong in numbers or in influence to become the established church in this country. Furthermore, our nation was well out of the colonial period before many of the states accepted in their con-

stitutions the principle of complete religious freedom, e. g., Massachusetts (1833); North Carolina (1835); New Jersey (1844); and the word *Protestant* has perdured in New Hampshire's religious clause into the twentieth century. Moreover, few American historians will claim that there was anything resembling full religious liberty for several decades after its magnanimous principles had been written into the state constitutions.

A few gratuitous assertions will arrest the attention of the Catholic reader, e. g., "Wherever Roman Catholicism secures dominance there you will have at least the threat of religious intolerance; wherever the Roman Catholics are a minority there—and there only—do they give even lip service to complete religious liberty" (p. 67). Perhaps that statement might be explained on the basis of a confusion of Catholic intolerance for error with an intolerance for persons lacking religious truth. But what explanation can be offered for the author's next sentence? "Here is a valid justification for seeing to it that the Roman Catholics be kept in a minority, not only in the United States but throughout the world, if the great principle of complete religious liberty is to be maintained" (p. 67). Such a statement might well cause his readers to wonder whether or not the author believes in the great blessing of full religious liberty which he lauds so highly in this work. Such sentiments disgraced our land in the last century with the burning of Catholic churches, schools, and convents when restriction was understood to mean destruction by some American Protestants. Writing of that nature can be dangerous as well as illogical.

Since this volume is an interpretation there is place for a difference of opinion. An indication of Professor Sweet's questionable interpretation of the Catholic Church in the United States and its policy may be gleaned from such statements as these:

> The unanimous support of Franco on the part of the American hierarchy and their bitter opposition to Protestant missions in South America are further proof, if further proof is needed, that the American prelates accept religious liberty only where Catholics are in the minority, but hold to a policy of intolerance of other faiths in countries where Catholics are in the majority. . . . Claiming to champion the cause of Christianity against godless communism, they are bidding for the support of the American people as a whole in their fight against Russia. . . . What has happened in Spain and Argentina and the official Roman Catholic attitudes toward these fascist sore spots has been too widely publicized for the American people to give free support to any Roman Catholic program for world support. (pp. 105-106).

Again:

> It is becoming quite apparent that the Roman Catholic hierarchy are aiming at a kind of world domination, inimical to the basic freedom of all our freedoms, religious liberty. . . . Also the anti-Russian propaganda

> endlessly carried on in the American Roman Catholic press and elsewhere has aroused concern on the part of many thoughtful people because it has undoubtedly increased the difficulty of reaching any satisfactory international adjustment which is so necessary now for the building of a peaceful world (pp. 108-109).

Of course, the reader will not have to be unusually discerning to recognize the last assertion as a solid tribute to the civil loyalty of Catholics, all the more objective, since it comes from a trained non-Catholic pen.

The *Official Catholic Directory* for 1947 placed the number of converts to Catholicism in the United States at 100,628. In view of the relative fewness of non-Catholics apart from Protestants in the United States these statistics would seem to cast doubt on the author's assurance that "the number of converts from Protestantism to Catholicism . . . have been relatively few" (p. 95). Also in light of the same figure cited above and mindful of the mounting number of native-born Catholics in the United States, many readers will refuse to accept the statement that "even today a great majority of the American people still look upon the Roman Catholic Church as a foreign transplantation that has never been acclimatized to the American political and cultural soil and the general assumption among them is that it never will nor can become so" (p. 102).

Professor Sweet admitted: "It is Protestantism, of course, which is responsible for the great multiplicity of denominations" (p. 62). However, in his listing of the causes for such divergence of belief one misses a great, if not *the* greatest, cause, disregard for doctrine. A distrust of any set creed colors several of the theological passages in this work. Indeed, the very word "theology" is used almost exclusively in a subjective sense. The fact that the lectures were given to a predominantly Protestant audience might explain why there is scarcely any treatment of Judaism in the United States.

Some misspellings mar an otherwise well printed book, e. g., calld (p. 31) for called; mantenance (p. 32) for maintenance; traversy (p. 54) for travesty; pentacostal (p. 72) for pentecostal; immigartion (p. 98) for immigration; Catholocism (p. 100) for Catholicism and cleaverages (p. 145) for cleavages. The volume has an adequate index. One should note in conclusion that to write an interpretative work surveying the field of American church history is a most difficult task. Collectively the Protestant sects form a majority in the United States. The history of these religious groups Professor Sweet has for the most part handled in a masterly fashion with strokes that are at times brilliant. But his treatment of the American Catholic Church is definitely superficial and what he has written on that subject should be read with more than the usual care.

HUGH J. NOLAN

St. Paul Seminary

Old Saint Patrick's, New York's First Cathedral. By Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O. S. U. (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society. 1947. Pp. 109. $2.50.)

Around the story of the cathedral church and parish the author has assembled much of New York Catholic history. Five chapters cover five periods, viz., the episcopate of Concanen, the administrations of Kohlmann and Fenwick, of Connolly, of Dubois, and of Hughes and McCloskey to 1879. The history of the church covers the selection of site and patron, erection and dedication, the fire of 1866, and the reconstruction completed in 1868. Two descriptions from 1815 and prints ranging from 1830 to 1869 add to the narrative. The struggles to pay for the building are included. The bishops and priests of St. Patrick's and others who participated in memorable ceremonies are given due attention. The writer seems to have ignored Vincent Hughes' biography of Concanen. The reader might believe that the first bishop excluded New York from his will, whereas his useful bequests were to be forwarded to New York from Kentucky. That the friars there did receive Concanen's books is mentioned in a letter of 1822 in the archives of San Clemente in Rome. Some readers might not know that Connolly was consecrated in Rome when they read "in Monte Magnanapoli." An interesting footnote on Bedini might have told that his clock, "gage d'estime et de reconnaissance" to Hughes, still tells the Archbishop of New York what time it is. One regrets the omission of the priceless story of McCloskey's arrival to take possession of his See of New York. Was the Mirafoschi who accompanied that cardinal's zucchetto rosso in the Swiss Guard? When European Catholics now look to us for aid it is timely to read here of New York's appeals in earlier days for European help, but in this connection the Leopoldine Foundation should not have been overlooked.

The priests of St. Patrick's were saints and sinners and Mother Peter gives us a rich portrait gallery. Benedict Fenwick and Thomas Levins, at different times in charge of the cathedral, can illustrate the contrasts, the one deservedly revered by all who knew him, the other suspended and working as an engineer on the Croton aqueduct. So, too, the laity. We see New York's first St. Vincent de Paul Society ministering to the poor and many firm in faith and obedience, while others fought in the cause of trusteeism or left the church for the neighboring saloons when Dubois preached. Excellent sections deal with Catholic education. The promising beginnings of Jesuit, Cistercian, and Ursuline schools in New York had failed when Connolly arrived in 1815; but to the surviving St. Peter's School was added St. Patrick's, still flourishing, and slowly our parish school system grew and survived the withdrawal of public funds while teaching communities made permanent foundations. The history of attacks from without introduces the sinister figures of Maria Monk, Orangemen,

Know-Nothings and the like but the book closes in the comparatively calm atmosphere of the McCloskey era and the new St. Patrick's was dedicated in 1879.

Mother Peter will find grateful readers. She has made judicious use of manuscript and printed sources and an excellent bibliography can guide students to further knowledge. We hope her pen will not be idle. The index could be better; names of importance in the history of St. Patrick's are omitted while Lacordaire is included although his only connection with St. Patrick's is that he did not come there.

JOSEPH M. EGAN

St. Frances of Rome Church
New York City

The Life of James Roosevelt Bayley, First Bishop of Newark and Eighth Archbishop of Baltimore, 1814-1877. By Sister M. Hildegarde Yeager, C.S.C. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1947. Pp. xi, 512. $4.50.)

The distinguished family connections of James Roosevelt Bayley and his promotion to the See of Baltimore in 1872 would have alone ensured him a place in the history of the Church in the United States. It is in a way unfortunate that it should be so, because the man himself is somewhat obscured by his famous name and by the position he held. He is remembered, very largely, as the eighth Archbishop of Baltimore, the nephew of Elizabeth Bayley Seton, and as the outstanding Catholic member of a family which has provided this country with two of its most colorful presidents. But of Bayley the man: gentle, scholarly, singlehearted and of singularly winning manner, we seldom hear anything. His great work as the organizer and builder of the Church in New Jersey is scarcely appreciated as it should be, and hitherto the lack of detailed and systematic knowledge of his life and his deeply religious personality have prevented us from realizing that in Bayley the priest were united those virtues and talents which made him a noble type of the American priesthood at its best.

Sister Hildegarde's painstaking and thorough study of Bayley as man, priest, and truly apostolic bishop has remedied all that. No one can say from now on that the career and achievements of this worthy and solid churchman have been neglected. More than that, she has provided us with the model of what the biography of an American bishop should be—the careful and orderly study of his work, to appreciate his achievements; the diligent and exhaustive study of his writings, formal and informal, to get an insight into his mind and to form a complete picture of the man; and all this placed against the background of the times in which he lived

with the social and economic forces which helped to shape his career and provide his life with its setting. There was nothing spectacular or brilliantly arresting about either the archbishop or his career. His conversion to the Catholic faith was the culmination of an orderly process of study and prayer, with nothing of the road to Damascus about it. His life as a priest was like that of thousands of other priests of his day and since; his episcopate was fruitful but not brilliant. He was a talented administrator and a gifted student, but he had no flashing oratorical power nor any conspicious mental gifts. But he was thoroughly rounded out—a good student, a forceful preacher, a capable administrator and above all a thoroughly religious and devout churchman. He fitted the part. His whole life was guided and directed by those principles which he eagerly absorbed in the seminary and which kept him priestly all his days.

He exemplifies above all, in the mind of this reviewer, the great importance of unflagging intellectual discipline even in the midst of an exceptionally busy life—the importance of being before doing. Circumstances did not permit the archbishop to be a scholar in the complete sense of the word but they did permit him to be a student who did not neglect the constant repairing of intellectual strength.

During the nearly twenty years of his episcopate in Newark, New Jersey, which he was chosen to rule only ten years after his conversion, James Roosevelt Bayley's life differed very little from that of the other American bishops of the period from 1853 to 1872. There were the same cares and heartaches, the ever present problem of financing the new churches and schools springing up on every side, the perennial need of providing priests, the constant menace of anti-Catholic bigotry.

His great achievement in New Jersey was the establishment of the Catholic school system, the cardinal importance of which he had recognized even before he was consecrated. Nor was he satisfied with building parish schools, in spite of the great financial difficulties involved; he also recognized the importance of higher learning for Catholics by the establishment of Seton Hall College as both college and seminary, and of St. Elizabeth's Academy for girls at Madison.

By introducing several religious orders into his diocese he furthered the good cause of religion, and by his support of Isaac Hecker and his associates, he contributed to the cause of religion not only in his diocese, but in the country at large. Added prestige was given to his name and to the episcopal office by his activities as writer and lecturer; here his talents found an outlet and were exercised as much as time and opportunity would permit. He demonstrated that had he the time to devote to it, he would be a great success in this work.

So passed the noonday of his life as a bishop. It was no surprise to those who knew of his singular success in Newark that he should be thought of

for the honor of Archbishop of Baltimore, but rumors of this change filled Bayley himself with alarm and dread. He was firmly rooted in Newark and would not bear transplanting. His fears proved well founded because his short five years in Baltimore were little like the years in Newark. Ill health, aggravated by the climate of Maryland, robbed him of the strength he needed to carry on successfully the work of archbishop and unofficial apostolic delegate. To this was added the apathy of the people, which Bayley could not understand, the more so because his people in Newark had been ready and glad to be led. He longed to be back in New Jersey, and he never really succeeded in uprooting himself.

In spite of these handicaps, the archbishop was able to consecrate the cathedral and to further the cause of religious education. His position brought him greater prominence than he would have achieved in Newark and caused his name to be remembered where it might otherwise have been forgotten. For this reason alone we may say that it was providential that he was promoted to Baltimore.

WILLIAM J. O'SHEA

St. Mary's Seminary
Roland Park

A New Assisi. The First Hundred Years of the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1849-1949. By Sister Mary Eunice Hanousek, O.S.F. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1948. Pp. xiv, 231. $5.00.)

This volume is a centennial dissertation on the foundation and development of the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, Sisters of Penance and Charity, by a member of the community. It has many illustrations, five appendices, fifteen pages of notes and references placed at the end of the book, and an index of a little more than four pages. There is also a foreword by the Most Reverend Moses E. Kiley, Archbishop of Milwaukee.

The book is quite fittingly divided into four parts: Planting, Storm, Growth, and Harvest. The Planting and the Storm depict the early years with the many difficulties that were caused by a division of minds regarding the real objectives of the sisterhood. The Storm was brought to an end by the separation into two distinct communities. Most of the sisters remained with the general superior, who had meanwhile established the motherhouse at La Crosse, Wisconsin. They are now known as the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Perpetual Adoration and constitute a flourishing community. The history of the second group, the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, Sisters of Penance and Charity, comprises the second part of the book, the Growth and the Har-

vest. They kept their motherhouse near St. Francis Seminary, just outside Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Besides continuing the domestic work in a few seminaries and episcopal residences, they have expanded their efforts into the educational field. At present they conduct sixty-six elementary schools, seven high schools, and one college. They are in charge of three orphanages, one school for the deaf, four catechetical schools, three schools for the mentally retarded, and have also undertaken mission work in China.

The latter part of the book is developed in a more or less statistical, although quite interesting, sequence from the facts found in the archives of the community, school bulletins and community papers, and from personal interviews. The historian will be more specially interested in the earlier history which is truly unique. Although Sister Eunice makes no mention of *Our Community*, published in 1920 by a member of the La Crosse community, it could easily form the backbone of the early chronicle. She has, however, indebted herself to historians by tracing the facts to their sources as far as possible. But it is unfortunate that she had no better guidance in the use of terms and titles, particularly when they are related to the German language, and that her statements and generalizations in the earlier chapters were not more carefully checked. This exposes her conclusions on the division of the community to criticism by those who have no direct access to the sources she possesses. Probably the final conclusions will not be found until we have an authoritative exposition of the lives of Archbishop Henni and Archbishop Heiss.

THEODORE ROEMER

St. Lawrence College
Mount Calvary, Wisconsin

Dalle Montagne Rocciose al Rio Bravo. Brevi appunti storici circa la missione gesuitica del Nuovo Messico e Colorado negli Stati Uniti di America. By Giuseppe M. Sorrentino, S.J. (Napoli: Casa Editrice Federico & Ardia. 1948. Pp. 307. L. 450.)

If any surprise is caused by a history, written in Italy, of the Jesuits in our own Southwest, it is quickly dissipated on learning that the author himself worked in that field and was led by a spirit of piety towards his co-workers to record their activities. The Jesuits who came to New Mexico in 1867 at the request of Bishop Lamy belonged to the Neapolitan province. Since they could not work among the Indians on account of the "opposition of some ecclesiastics," they had to confine their efforts to Mexicans; soon, however, they ministered also to American Catholics. Gradually their activities became grouped around Albuquerque, Denver, and El Paso, so that in 1919, when the mission came to an end, they were administering seventeen parishes and about 100 missions and stations. Pastoral work, however, was not their sole occupation; before long they

became engaged in education, first in grade schools, and then in colleges at Las Vegas, New Mexico, and Morrison, Colorado, which were finally merged into one college at Denver. About 1873 they started a Catholic press at Albuquerque and founded *La Revista Católica*. That the mission made its importance felt in the American Church can be seen in the appointment of one of its members, Anthony J. Schuler, S.J., at first Bishop of El Paso when the diocese was created in 1915.

Difficulties were not wanting. The Jesuits repeatedly experienced bigotry; there were financial controversies and bitter disputes, told with unusual freedom, with Bishop Bourgade over property rights at El Paso, and with Archbishop Salpointe over jurisdiction at Las Vegas. Relations with the mother province were not always happy owing to the old complaint of distance and inability of superiors to understand American conditions and needs. It was these latter, together with the natural development of the Church in the United States, that finally led to separation from Naples and to the decree of August 15, 1919, whereby the houses of the mission were united to two American Jesuit provinces.

For sources, more than 3,000 documents, edited and unedited, preserved in the provincial archives at Naples were used; a general list is given at the end of the volume. It is evident, however, that the Martinez affair (p. 30 f.) has been taken almost verbatim from Defouri, *Historical Sketch of the Catholic Church in New Mexico*. There are practically no footnotes.

Father Sorrentino unfolds his story in almost chronicle style, dividing it into nine chapters according to the administration of the eight superiors who guided the mission during the fifty-two years of its existence. This method naturally entails a disconnected account; insignificant details are tiring; many observations are in the best manner of Italian clichés; an analytical index is missing. No attempts will be made here to point out the inaccuracies in the introductory chapter. There can be no doubt, however, that the book fills a gap in American church history and the part played by the Society of Jesus. The abundant details and biographical data—if they do not contribute to smooth reading—will be greatly appreciated by the local historian.

JOHN B. WUEST

Duns Scotus College
Detroit

GENERAL HISTORY

Configurations of Culture Growth. By A. L. Kroeber. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1944. Pp. x, 882. $7.50.)

In the history of civilization it would seem to be an accepted fact that the greatest achievements of a given people or cultural area occur in

relatively short periods of time. Some explanations of this fact have been offered in the past, but until recently the whole problem was never investigated systematically in detail and on a world-wide basis. From the early 1930's an ever increasing attention has been drawn to the problem through Toynbee's epoch-making *A Study of History*, which is still in progress. In some measure, of course, Spengler's *Decline of the West* (original German edition, 1921-1922, English translation, 1926-1928) had prepared the way for Toynbee's work, although it is radically different from the latter in essential aspects.

The book under review although published in 1944, was completed between 1931 and 1938. Under the circumstances the author, one of the most distinguished among contemporary anthropologists, believed it necessary to state formally in his bibliography (p. 849) that he did not read either Toynbee's *Study of History* (six volumes, 1935-1939) or Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (4 volumes, 1937-1941) before his own work was finished. In actual fact, his book differs very much from the treatments of Toynbee and Sorokin in organization, emphases, and philosophical point of view.

Kroeber states his purpose thus in Chapter I, "Problem and Procedure:"

> The problem I have set myself in this book is an investigation of one of the forms which culture takes. This form is the frequent habit of societies to develop their cultures to their highest levels spasmodically: especially in their intellectual and aesthetic aspects, but also in more material and practical respects. The cultures grow, prosper, and decline, in the opinion of the world. How far they tend to be successful in their several activities, simultaneously, or close together, or far apart in time, and how much variation in this regard is of record, is part of the problem. The type of phenomenon has been frequently noted, or has been widely taken for granted; it has not been systematically investigated, so far as I know, by a comparison of all available facts; that is to say, investigated empirically instead of intuitively or a priori (p. 5).

Kroeber is not concerned primarily with the characteristic content and specific quality of high cultural developments and their possible "causes," but rather with what he calls "growth configurations—configurations in time, in space and in degree of achievements" (p. 6).

In the first part of his study Kroeber examines separately in successive chapters the development of the following intellectual and aesthetic activities: philosophy, science, philology, sculpture, painting, drama, literature, and music, in order to determine the growth of their quality or value curves in terms not only of time but also of geographical localization. Thus, Chapter II contains separate treatments of Greek, later Mediterranean, Arab-Muslim, occidental, mediaeval, modern, Indian, and Chinese philosophy, followed by a comparison of the development of each of these

with that of the others. Science, philology, etc., are handled in the same manner in Chapters III-IX.

Chapter X, "The Growth of Nations" (pp. 661-750), constitutes the second part of Kroeber's book. The data covering all the intellectual and aesthetic activities of a given area or nationality are grouped and examined here against the background of political history. "This yields a profile of national—or integral—culture developments."

Chapter XI, "Review and Conclusions" (pp. 759-846), as the title indicates, contains a critical evaluation of all the data presented and analysed in the preceding chapters—including a systematic comparison of the author's findings with some of the major theses of Spengler (pp. 825-833) followed by a summary of the principal conclusions (pp. 838-846). Among the major results or conclusions the following may be mentioned. 1. "It is clear that aesthetic and intellectual endeavors resulting in higher values preponderantly realize themselves in temporary bursts, or growths, in all the higher civilizations examined." 2. "Geniuses are the indicators of the realization of coherent pattern growths of cultural value. . . . More individuals born with the endowment of genius have been inhibited by the cultural situations into which they were born than have been developed by other cultural situations." 3. "The reason for the transience of high-value patterns is not clear." 4. "In well-unified and well-defined civilizations the configurations of growth and decline may be clean-cut even though marked by several crests." 5. "The growth curves are sometimes symmetrical . . . sometimes skew." 6. "The duration [of growth] is also extremely variable." 7. "There is no clear evidence of a tendency toward acceleration of growth as we pass from ancient to modern times." 8. "There is an evident tendency for growths in distinct activities to be associated in time, but no clear indication that a successful growth in one activity must be accompanied by growths in other activities." 9. "There is no marked evidence of an inherent order of succession in which the several cultural activities develop." 10. "Religion, however, in general precedes aesthetic and intellectual developments of note, and a history of the arts is frequently one of gradual emancipation from religion as they attain their culminations." 11. "Geographically, a radiating spread of culture growth can usually be traced from a first hearth or focus over the larger area finally occupied." 12. "The question whether a whole culture can die of itself through internal causes or inherent aging is not answered."

The book contains a classified bibliography (pp. 849-858), and an adequate index (861-882). While not overloaded with technical jargon, as are so many recent books on the social sciences, the author's style is a bit heavy and monotonous. It is not the least of Toynbee's merits that he has made us style-conscious again in historical writing.

Professor Kroeber has made a significant contribution to our knowledge of cultural rises, durations, and declines in world history, and he has based

his discussions and conclusions on a vast amount of factual data. Through his emphasis on cultural patterns, he has often placed the cultural achievements of given peoples and epochs in a new and clearer light. Historians can profit very much from a critical reading of this book. Critical reading is stressed, because there are weaknesses in the work which must not be glossed over.

In the first place, the role of the individual in cultural developments is repeatedly minimized. A valid interpretation of his own evidence will hardly justify the author's assertion that "The more naïve attitude—which the abler historians have pretty well transcended without formally repudiating it—is obviously akin to the belief that the human will is free. One can write history without holding this belief, but much history is written as if the will were free" (p. 8). Again, his own partly qualified statement, "that apparently greater, culturally productive individuals appear in history, on the whole, prevailingly in clusters," does not support the sweeping generalization which immediately follows: "This makes their appearance a function of sociocultural events" (p. 10). Persons are instruments rather than agents: "At the same time, personality is not denied: it remains unimpaired, but as a vehicle or instrument instead of as an agent" (p. 763). Throughout his work Kroeber has great difficulty in fitting a number of universally recognized geniuses into his scheme—among them, Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, Leibnitz, and Goya—and at times he is forced to resort to the Procrustean method. While not denying at all a great influence of environment, the reviewer believes that the evidence presented indicates definitely that the individual enjoying free will must still be considered an essential factor in cultural rises, etc., and that it, therefore, supports Toynbee's position regarding creative individuals and creative minorities.

In the second place, the role of religion—which is regarded by the author from the view point of materialistic rationalism—is not sufficiently emphasized or properly evaluated as a dynamic or even a dominant force, especially before modern times. He formally excludes religion from the cultural configurations examined on the ground that growths and declines in religion are very difficult to evaluate, and, therefore, are hard to compare with such developments in the arts and sciences (p. 799). Yet he does not hesitate to advance the view—however tentative—that a strong religion tends to take over and subordinate the arts and sciences to its own use, and that these "accordingly remain on a relatively low level" until, after some growth under difficulties, they liberate themselves and become secularized (pp. 801-802). The weakness of the book in dealing with religion and religious literature is, perhaps, most typically obvious in the brief and unsatisfactory treatment of Palestinian literature (p. 488).

In the third place, the validity of the author's method in gathering data is open to some criticism. It is in part responsible for the weaknesses on

the religious side just mentioned, and also for certain incorrect evaluations or omissions in his work. He has deliberately relied on the data furnished by textbooks and encyclopedias, partly for convenience but chiefly because such works reflect currently conventional evaluations of achievements, are timid "about departing from the accepted norm," and may be considered "precipitates of many opinions" (p. 849). The author has apparently forgotten that very often there is a time-lag of ten or twenty years between the state of our knowledge as reflected in such conservatively written works, and the latest scholarship as represented in the most recent articles and monographs. Hence he has not always escaped the danger, which is inherent in his method, of building an argument on data which are incomplete or which have been given a new and better interpretation.

Owing to limitations of space, only the following criticisms of the work in detail can be presented. Page 37: The statement that Graeco-Roman civilization "assimilated the new Christian trends," is ambiguous to say the least. Page 40: Dionysius should be called Pseudo-Dionysius, Martianus Capella and Cassiodorus can hardly be called philosophers, the Christianity of Boethius is today unquestioned, and Isidore should be considered a theologian and philologist rather than a philosopher. Page 52-53: The observations, "By the Church, Thomism was embalmed," and, "As a creative or solidly constructive movement, scholasticism was over soon after 1300 or 1310," betray a lack of familiarity with the neo-scholastic movement in our own times and its influence outside the Catholic Church. Page 245 ff: In the evaluation of Mesopotamian art no mention whatever is made of the Hurrite contribution and its problems. Page 489: The statements on the relations of literature and religion among the Greeks require considerable modification. Page 518: It is not clear what the author means by ascribing to St. Jerome the "basis of the Vulgate." Prudentius should be listed for epic as well as lyric poetry. Page 535 ff: In this section on occidental literatures there is no formal treatment of mediaeval Latin literature in spite of its great achievements especially in poetry, and Celtic literature is omitted entirely. Page 787: It is interesting to learn that "Scholastic Philosophy . . . astonishing in its acuity and skill, is of little value to human culture as a whole except as a virtuoso performance." The bibliography, as already indicated, is essentially made up of textbooks, many of which are elementary and antiquated. For Greek literature, e.g., the only text cited is that of G. A. Murray (1915, a reprint of the first edition, 1897); for Latin literature, H. N. Fowler (1923) and A. Gudeman, (1923); for French literature, G. Saintsbury (1889). No formal histories of Christian Greek and Latin literature were employed. For ancient and mediaeval philosophy and science Sarton is listed as the chief authority. There is no mention of the latest editions of Ueberweg or of DeWulf.

This work, in spite of its shortcomings, is an important contribution, but the passages in which the author crosses the boundaries of his de-

scription of phenomena in order to generalize or philosophize must be read with special care.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE
The Catholic University of America

The Meaning of Human History. By Morris R. Cohen. (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co. 1947. Pp. ix, 304. $4.00.)

The death of Morris Raphael Cohen on January 28, 1947, was a distinct loss to American philosophers, but likewise to a host of others who knew him less as the formal philosopher than as the man of wisdom who examined with deep insight the fundamental issues at stake in other fields such as science and the scientific method, the social order, the philosophy of law, etc. The present volume is the result of the last of such excursions on the part of Professor Cohen, for, as Paul Carus Lecturer in 1944, he chose to deal with what is usually termed the philosophy of history.

Professor Cohen's book does not offer us a philosophy of history as such; it has not the systematic and synthetic character of a treatise on the subject. Nor does it seem to have been the author's intention to explain to his readers the meaning of history; he must rather have wished to re-examine certain metaphysical truths that are basic to a true explanation of human history and to re-assess the value and relative importance of various factors and approaches that have been used in attempting such an explanation. After a first general chapter introducing us to the problems of the book, three subsequent chapters treat of the more strictly philosophical matters, not in a speculative but in an eminently practical way. The author's reflections are carefully ordered to the point of view and the procedure of the historian. Three more chapters examine certain factors that enter into the shaping of history: the geographic factor (including all things in nature lower than man), the biologic element, and the role of great men. If Professor Cohen prefers one particular approach to history rather than another, it is the one commonly referred to as "institutional," and this he develops in Chapter VIII. The last two chapters deal briefly with some of the more comprehensive explanations of history that have been offered throughout the ages, giving considerable attention to the cyclical view and the "liberal" view of history, and stressing in conclusion the need of an ethical interpretation of history which, however, is kept at the natural level and carefully distinguished from anything supernatural or revealed.

The publishers speak of "the astringent wisdom, the courageous independence of mind and the severely critical method" of all Professor Cohen's work. These qualities are well exemplified in the present volume. The book abounds in sound, well-balanced, and truly wise observations and judgments on history, historical method, and philosophy of history. There

is, perhaps, little that is startlingly original in what Professor Cohen has to say; his independence of mind is manifested rather in his frank criticism of, and strong reaction against, the aberrations and extravagances of certain modern positions, some of which have had a very considerable vogue: historicism, scepticism, relativism, historical materialism, to mention but a few. His critical mind is perfectly aware of the confusion produced by the intrusion into history of principles that belong properly to other branches of human knowledge like psychology and sociology, as it is likewise aware of the deceptive plausibility of facile generalizations. He both uses and advocates a rigorously critical method.

The reviewer will, perhaps, be pardoned if he ventures to single out for comment one important conclusion of Professor Cohen, which is at the same time a principle underlying what he himself has written, viz., that, since history consists in "human events," our interpretation of history will necessarily be in terms of our concept of the nature of man (p. 229). We may quite justifiably and very usefully choose to examine history from some one particular point of view, whether it be political, economic, cultural, religious, or other; but we must not slip into the fallacy that the point of view of our choosing offers a full explanation of history. The true and complete meaning of human history can be had only when all aspects of the human beings and human activities that constitute history are grasped. God alone can know the *full* meaning of human history. Even partial explanations, nevertheless, can contribute to a fuller realization by men of what is known completely to God alone. A sound philosophy of man will be our surest safeguard against mistaking a partial explanation for the whole; it will aid likewise in integrating the part into the whole; and it will finally make the partial contribution the more illuminating because it is seen in its true perspective. Professor Cohen has limited himself almost exclusively to the consideration of human history at the natural level only and, therefore, to the "philosophy" of history in the strict sense of the term. A "theology" of history would need to go further and take the supernatural likewise into consideration; certainly the full and complete meaning of human history could not omit such fundamental realities as creation, grace, the Incarnation, etc. The author was perfectly free to confine his point of view, as he has done. to the natural order. Even within this limitation, the patterns in human life are manifold. Mr. Cohen has been keenly aware of them and consequently of what he so aptly terms the "multidimensionality" of history; man may be but a *micro*cosm, but his *cosmic* character remains very real just the same.

All in all, this is a heartening book for those concerned with history. It is made extremely readable by the lucid style and no less so by the excellent typographical presentation.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies GEORGE B. FLAHIFF
Toronto

Man and the State. Edited by William Ebenstein. (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc. 1947. Pp. xvi, 781. $5.00.)

This book by William Ebenstein, associate professor of politics at Princeton University and author of well-known studies on fascist Italy and nazi Germany, is designed as a survey of modern political ideas. They are not presented in a chronological, historical order. There are four major divisions: The Foundation of Democracy; Anti-Democratic Thought; Capitalism, Socialism, Planning; From Nationalism to World Order. These parts are subdivided into chapters, e.g., Part II, Anti-Democratic Thought, contains the following ones: The Politics of Pessimism, The Idol State, the Cry for the Leader, Fascism: Government by Force and Lies. Ebenstein does not restate the various ideas: "The most direct way of acquainting oneself with the statement (of them) is to go back to the great writers themselves. This is the method employed in the present book. However, I have prefaced each chapter of selections from original sources with a short introductory essay of my own."

Does the author successfully accomplish his intention of acquainting the reader with modern political ideas? Serious doubts must be expressed about the organization and selection of the basic texts. Ebenstein apparently could not make up his mind whether he was presenting a work dealing with political ideas from the time of Machiavelli to the present, or only with political and social problems of the post-war world. Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau are quoted, but not such classics as, e.g., Bodin, Montesquieu, Harrington, and Bentham. The selections are highly arbitrary; there is too much Laski, whereas such English political scientists as Bryce, Barker, and Figgis are omitted. French thought is very much neglected—Tocqueville, Gobineau, Proudhon, Duguit, Hauriou, G. Sorel are not presented. The Declaration of Independence is to be found and also a short excerpt from a letter of Jefferson, but neither Hamilton nor Calhoun! On the other hand, much that is quoted is simply contemporary and has no lasting value, e.g., an article by Eastman belonging to his Trotskyite period. The whole arrangement is highly subjective. The author is manifestly interested in the difficulties confronting moderate democratic socialism. He has some understanding of the moral-ethical basis of political ideas, but he omits almost completely all religious traditions and issues. There are no selections showing the influence of Catholic and Protestant thought on the development of political ideals, if one does not count some occasional hints about the reactionary character of Catholic political thought. There is no chapter on relations between Church and State. The papal encyclicals are not utilized and the Catholic political philosophers of our time are represented by a few pages from Maritain. Sturzo, John A. Ryan, and Christopher Dawson cannot be found in the pages of Ebenstein's book. Protestant political thought is

overlooked. On the other hand, a very unimportant attack against the pro-Franco attitude of Catholic bishops by Wedgwood is reprinted.

The introductory pages to the various chapters are of unequal value. The remarks on Hobbes' political philosophy are very useful, whereas the judgments on Hegel are somewhat oversimplified. Ebenstein descends sometimes to the level of over-excited polemical journalism, as in his denunciation of Hayek. The problem of the relations between liberalism and democracy are not dealt with. The basic idea of the book is good, but it has not been carried out successfully. The systematic, doctrinaire, and highly subjective approach does not afford deep insights into various trends of modern political ideas. The failure of Professor Ebenstein is highly regrettable. A detached and objective presentation of selections from political thinkers of the modern age with brief introductory characteristics of their basic problems and approaches would be very useful for students of social science, politics, and history.

WALDEMAR GURIAN

University of Notre Dame

A History of Portugal. By H. V. Livermore. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. xvi, 502. $10.00.)

A comprehensive history of Portugal in English is long overdue. While books devoted to special subjects have appeared none has been published covering the whole field since the volume in the Story of the Nations Series by Henry Morse Stephens in 1891. The present time is opportune because of the enthusiasm shown in Portugal in the recent commemoration of centennials of outstanding events in national history. The most important of these was the celebration in 1940 of the foundation as a kingdom eight centuries earlier and the emancipation from the domination of Spain three centuries ago.

The author has lived in Portugal so that it is not strange that he has devoted more space to the early history of Portugal up to the reign of King Diniz in 1279 and to the period of the Restoration than to the better and, to many, the more interesting period of 361 years which intervened. The first eight chapters cover the history of Lusitania, the Gothic Kingdoms, the Moslem occupation, and the County of Portugal. Then follow the chapters concerning the foundation of the kingdom and Afonso Henriques, the reign of Sancho I, Church and State, and the completion of the conquest. It was during the reign of King Diniz that the condition of the farmers was greatly improved, a university was founded, and a navy established. The voyages of discovery along the African coast under the direction of half-English Henry the Navigator followed the capture of Ceuta in 1415. During the reign of King Manuel (1495-1521) Portugal reached the climax of her history and for a short time was one of the richest

nations in Europe. The monopoly of European commerce in the Indian Ocean was secured following the voyage of da Gama; Brazil was discovered and but for the untimely death of Queen Isabel, eldest daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella and of her infant son, the House of Aviz would have succeeded to the throne of Castile. But Portugal soon thereafter lost her high position and in 1580 came under the rule of Spain. She was then involved in the Spanish wars with England, France, and the Netherlands. English and Dutch vessels reached the Far East and a Dutch colony was established in Brazil. When Portuguese liberty was restored in 1640 conditions had changed. Foreign alliances were made but Portuguese tranquility was harrassed by the War of the Spanish Succession and the Peninsular War. In 1828, when a constitutional monarchy was established, Portugal was again at low ebb and Brazil had secured her independence. A republic was formed in 1910 and the author relates in his concluding chapter the development of the reforms now being made by Prime Minister Salazar to uplift his people and to benefit the Portuguese colonies. The book contains twenty-six chapters each sub-divided into about six sections. In the sub-divisions an opportunity is afforded to present factual history concisely without the necessity of literary embellishments and to condense the material into a single volume. The author is also able to discuss at some length many subjects such as local history, the *cortes*, the relations between Portugal and England, and the history of the Church in Portugal. The text is followed by a bibliography and a "Reference Index" which does not refer to the contents of the volume but describes encyclopedically many subjects of interest relating to Portugal and her colonies. Here is also a list of Portuguese rulers which properly belongs after the introduction. There are seven maps and thirteen illustrations.

The author has made a diligent search to secure material from Portuguese publications for the historian unacquainted with the language. While this book may not be considered outstanding it is now the most up-to-date presentation of Portuguese history in English.

WILLIAM B. GREENLEE

Newberry Library

Total Power: A Footnote to History. By Edmund A. Walsh. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co. 1948. Pp. viii, 373. $5.00.)

Father Walsh's volume deals with many topics. The first book describes the fate of General Haushofer after the collapse of the nazi regime; having gone through many interrogations about his role in the Third Reich, the German geopolitician committed suicide together with his wife. I think that these six chapters are the most valuable ones; they give a useful introduction to geopolitics and its distortion by Haushofer. Father Walsh's judgment is very fair. He concedes some correct ideas on the relations

between men and geography to the teacher of Hess, but on the other hand he does not hide his evil influences. Haushofer disagreed with Hitler, he himself claimed, since 1938, and after Hess' flight to England shortly before Hitler's attack on the USSR, he fell into open disgrace. His son and collaborator, Albrecht, participated in the preparation of the attempt against Hitler which failed in June, 1944; he was jailed and brutally murdered immediately before the Russian troops conquered Berlin. It is interesting to note that his secret peace proposals of 1941 appeared as very favorable to Germany. According to these, Germany would retain a supremacy in southeastern Europe, and she would probably keep Alsace-Lorraine even with frontiers improved in her favor.

The second and third books—Power and Challenge—contain general ideas on the rise and methods of totalitarianism. It must be said that these chapters are vague and confused. Their basic ideas are surely sound: uncontrolled power is evil; modern secularization is most responsible for the cruelties and brutalities characteristic of the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century. The totalitarian menace has not disappeared with the destruction of the nazi regime, but continues in the policies of the USSR. Modern technical progress has changed radically the foreign policies of the United States; isolationism is no longer possible, and the United States has today a particular world responsibility. It is also a merit of Father Walsh that he criticizes those so-called liberals and progressives who do not realize the character of Soviet policies, though it would have been helpful if he had been more specific; why does he not give the names of at least some of the professors whom he attacks on page 29?

But all these views—with which one must agree—are presented in a very loose and disorganized way. There are many errors of detail. For example, Kleist was not married and, therefore, did not commit suicide with his wife; neither Hegel nor Fichte were professors of history in Berlin. But worse is the lack of precise historical and systematic ideological analysis. The quotations from Kant do not show exactly the influence Kantianism exercised on the rise of nazism and on the development of its ideology. It is not sufficient to accumulate quotations and list many names in order to give a convincing history of ideas. The discussion of the general concept of revolution does not clearly bring out, despite some attempts, the various kinds of revolution. How useful it would have been if Father Walsh had described the various causes for the changes of regimes according to Aristotle and Polybius—he quotes the corresponding chapters but he does not apply in detail their ideas, and does not try to find out the specific features of the Russian totalitarian revolution which have so much influenced nazism and fascism. The views on modern secularism give the impression that Father Walsh ascribes all evil exclusively to modern times, overlooking limitations and internal conflicts in the society of the Middle Ages.

The author characterizes his book as "leaves from a Nuremberg diary and fragments of a more detailed study" (p. v), but that is not sufficient excuse for the superficial analysis of the background and methods of modern totalitarian power. It would have been much better if he had simply presented his daily observations during his stay in Germany. Some of his quotations describing nazi atrocities from uncovered German documents will impress those who were inclined to dismiss some accusations against the leading groups of the Third Reich as propaganda. Interesting are the self-defense of Haushofer, which is fully printed, and a brief annex describing Tojo's defense of Japanese policies.

The reviewer is embarrassed to be so critical about a book by such a distinguished writer as the Regent of the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, but he believes that it is necessary in the interest of the reputation of Catholics among students of modern totalitarianism to be outspoken. The imperfections of Father Walsh's chapters may be misused to discredit the ethical principles and basic views on men and history which he presents, but which he does not support with a precise and differentiating study of the concrete socio-historical material.

WALDEMAR GURIAN

University of Notre Dame

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

The Capture of Damietta. By Oliver of Paderborn. Translated by John J. Gavigan. [Translations and Reprints. Edited by John L. La Monte. Vol. II. Third Series.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 112. $1.25.)

The disasters of the year 1187 in the annals of the Latins in the East brought about the third and fourth crusades. The failure of both ventures turned many crusaders to the notion of shifting tactics from a frontal attack in Palestine to a flank attack on Egypt. Some of the original crusaders of 1098 had seen the necessity of such a movement but not much action was taken until the fifth crusade. Oliver of Paderborn was the combat historian of the Latin attack.

Oliver was priest, scholar, preacher of the fifth crusade in the Low Countries, military engineer, Bishop of Paderborn, and Cardinal-Bishop of Santa Sabina. He went to Acre and journeyed thence on the invasion of Egypt. Pope Innocent III had perceived the tactical value of attacking Egypt, thereby bringing pressure on the Saracen hold over the Holy Land. Oliver keenly calls Damietta "the key to all of Egypt" (p. 47). His great achievement is the narrative of events happening before the city of Damietta. Oliver was a man aware of God's might and the aptness of scriptural quotations, but the essence of his account is in its military import. If he describes the countryside, it is as seen through the soldier's awareness of the advantages of terrain. The legend of Prester John is a

belief in the potentialities of John's three armies. He is aware of the military doctrine of fire and movement, artillery barrage on stationary enemy positions, pre-attack barrage, dawn attack, defense in depth, discipline, and the lack of it, military intelligence on enemy capabilities, the problems of logistics, order of battle, scouts, flank guards, orderly and disorderly retreat, the necessity of unified military council, and above all, chain of command. He was loyal to Legate Pelagius as representative of the Holy See, but he leaves little doubt as to that prelate's lack of grasp on tactical realities when he refers to the excommunicated King John who "reflected more deeply on the matter, and wisely showed that the proposal so often proffered by the enemy ought to be accepted. . . ." The terms offered were the enemy's willingness to return the Holy Cross, liberate all prisoners, and restore the entire Kingdom of Jerusalem except the fortresses of Krak and Montreal. To accept, in the eyes of King John and the native baronage, was politically and tactically proper; to accept, in the view of Legate Pelagius, was to traffic with the enemy. This difference between the outlook of the western mind grown old quickly in the East, and the enthusiasm of the newly-arrived westerner was a factor leading to bitterness, excommunications, and the ultimate failure of the whole crusading project.

Oliver's latinity and ambiguities are problems with which Father Gavigan coped with much success. However, the sentence, "We, crying out to Heaven, did not hesitate to rush into battle, but manfully stood our ground . . ." (p. 44), might be put more clearly; "sour liquid" (p. 26) is probably vinegar which was used to extinguish Greek fire; the list of prelates enumerated on page 13 might be misleading as all were not archbishops; "Bergundy" (n.7., p. 13) is undoubtedly a typographical error. The translator's rendition of the chronological terms *feria prima, feria secunda,* etc., may very well be questioned. The translation is particularly valuable as another source document on the fifth crusade which has been neglected by historians. Moreover, it is the product of co-operation between editor and translator, with emphasis on sound scholarship and the rendition of difficult Latin into fluent English. A forthcoming publication, the result of several years study, on Cardinal Pelagius by Father Joseph Donovan will be a welcome addition.

JEREMIAH F. O'SULLIVAN

Fordham University

The Divine Comedy. A New Translation into English Blank Verse. By LAWRENCE GRANT WHITE. Engravings by Gustave Doré. (New York: Pantheon Books. 1948. Pp. xiv, 188. $6.50.)

This seems to me the best translation of the *Divine Comedy* at present available in English. There are, of course, many shortcomings. There

are many inaccuracies in regard to the finer points of Dante's meaning. But for the practical historian, and particularly for the mediaeval historian, who needs to know the *Divine Comedy* as a document of cultural history, but who is not at home in Dante's Italian, this is the version to use. It has long been obvious that attempts to reproduce in English the effect of Dante's *terza rima* have failed. Even the less ambitious attempts to give us some kind of rime—brave and even beautiful in parts as some of these have been—have had to torture hundreds and hundreds of lines for the sake of the endings. By being content with blank verse Mr. White has given us enough rhythm to please the ear, but he has been free enough to keep the straightforward run of Dante's diction.

A good illustration is the twentieth canto of the *Purgatory*. Every historian needs to know that canto, if for nothing else, at least for the lines about the outrage of Anagni and Philip le Bel's robbery of the Templars. This is the canto that involved Dom Patrick Cummins in the line, "than over its own flesh the purse to waggle," in order to find a rime for 'haggle' and 'straggle;' and in the more unfortunate line, "his wrong in France to show elsewhere still wronger," in order to find a rime for 'stronger' and 'longer.' Notice how easily Mr. White can handle Dante's lines:

> Perchè men paia il mal futuro e il fatto,
> veggio in Alagna intrar lo fiordaliso,
> e nel vicario suo Cristo esser catto.
> Veggiolo un' altra volta esser deriso;
> veggio rinovellar l' aceto e 'l fele,
> tra vivi ladroni esser anciso.
> Veggio il novo Pilato sì crudele,
> che ciò nol sazia, ma sanza decreto
> porta nel Tempio le cupide vele.
> (*Purg.* 20. 85-93).

> But now our other evil deeds will pale:
> The fleur-de-lis will enter in Alagna
> And capture Christ himself, seizing the person
> Of His own vicar—thus a second time
> I see Him mocked with vinegar and gall,
> Slain once more between two living thieves.
> I see this later Pilate so relentless
> That this is not enough; but urged by greed,
> He sails on farther, to the very Temple.

No. This is not Shakespeare nor Milton. But it is a great deal nearer in both sense and sound to what Dante wrote than—to cite only the latest of the rimed versions—the translation which begins:

> See wrong o'er 'was' and 'will be' high uprisen:
> Alagna's fate by fleur-de-lys decided,
> and Christ himself in vicar dragged to prison.

"But man's will is sometimes powerless"—as Mr. White translates Dante's "ma non può tutto la virtù che vole" (*Purg.* 21. 105). The best will in the world can never recapture in English the subtle inflections of, e.g., Dante's contemptuous denunciation of the 'outrageous gang' of the Adimari in canto 16 of the *Paradiso* (lines 115-118). Mr. White does pretty well:

> That haughty race that rages like a dragon
> Behind a man that flees, but acts the lamb
> To him that shows his teeth or even his purse,
> Was rising, but from humble origins.

This, at any rate, is the sense in plain English, without the tortured involutions of some of the rimed renderings.

A good test of any translator of Dante is the line,

> l' ardor del desiderio in me finii (*Par.* 38.48).

By *finii*, Dante means that he brought the ardor of his longing to its utmost consummation. This is suggested by the crescendo indicated by the alliteration. Most of the translators, missing the marvelous sound of the line, take *finii* to mean 'I put an end to' or 'I quenched' my desires. Mr. White is ambiguous: 'I . . . ended, as was meet, within myself the ardor of my longing.'

The volume is well bound and beautifully printed; and, all in all, Doré's illustrations are still the most satisfying suggestions of Dante's imagination.

GERALD G. WALSH

Fordham University

Nicholaus of Autrecourt. A Study in Fourteenth Century Thought. By Julius Rudolph Weinberg. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 242. $3.75.)

Mr. Weinberg's book is the first study of all the edited writings of an important mid-fourteenth-century polemicist. Nicholaus' early controversies furnish the chief material of the first part of the volume, treating of his critical attack on Aristotle. The second part draws mainly upon the later *Exigit* and the *Quaestio utrum visio*, which form in Mr. Weinberg's view, the constructive part of Nicholaus' philosophy, his probabilism.

For his critical philosophy, Nicholaus finds the only unshakable ground of certitude to be the principle of non-contradiction. But "there is no attempt to derive the law of non-contradiction from the existence of substance" in the Aristotelian manner (pp. 14-16, 28). It is a completely formal principle, devoid of content, and justified by itself, i.e., it is "assumed . . . because its negation entails a contradiction" (p. 15). However, in order to have discourse there must be some content. Content is

provided by perception. How can content be justified at all, once one lays down a thoroughly formal principle as sole source of certitude? What is known in a perception is only the perception itself: it is its own object and nothing beyond it is evident. Thus, in lacking transcendental relation to an object other than itself, the act of perception is thoroughly simple, immediate, 'not other than itself.' That is to say, it perfectly exemplifies the principle of non-contradiction and is thereby intrinsically justified as certain.

However, in the second and problematic part of Nicholaus' philosophy, the principle of the good is brought in from nowhere and made to serve as a bridge for probable knowledge of independent reality: *nihil frustra in natura;* therefore, knowledge is not in vain but is after all a knowledge of things. This part is obviously weak, internally contradictory, and a direct violation of the critical part. Mr. Weinberg's attempt to make something positive out of it is itself *frustra.*

This study is not altogether satisfactory. A lack of historical sense is evinced at more than one point. For example, the author talks vaguely of "scholasticism" as though it were all of a piece (pp. 3, 119 etc.). He fails to make historical research into the origin of certain terms that would give insight into the aims and origins of Nicholaus' thought, e.g., the method of "salvare apparentia" (p. 228, 1.13, O'Donnell ed.), which Nicholaus uses to describe his work, but which method the Greeks did *not* identify with Aristotelian dialectic (cf. Duhem), and the "esse objectivum," which is at the scotistic origin of the straw man of indirect realism beaten down by Nicholaus. From these failings proceed others. Mr. Weinberg overestimates the range of applicability of Nicholaus' critique to mediaeval philosophies, and, hence, the importance of his own exposition in the current philosophical scene (introduction). It is highly questionable to what extent Nicholaus, "steeped in Aristotelian conceptions and procedures" (p. 3), understood the epistemic position of Thomism, for example, or grasped the extent to which it is or is not an Aristotelianism. Mr. Weinberg also indulges occasionally in innuendo: "alleged experts" *vs* "impartial judge" (pp. 121-123). The references given on page 209 do not check.

In spite of such drawbacks Mr. Weinberg's work is a useful study.

JOHN J. GLANVILLE

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Toronto

The Merchant Class of Medieval London (1300-1500). By Sylvia Thrupp. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1948. Pp. xix, 401. $6.00.)

This is a book based upon years of patient and intelligent research in a vast mass of manuscript material in addition to the printed material in the

hope of reaching some conclusions of what London merchant life was like in the later Middle Ages. There are chapters on the economic and social position of London merchants in their own community; on their activities in the city government; wealth and standards of living and the conduct of life; the fluidity of the merchant class; trade and gentility; with a final chapter giving a general view of the middle strata of the nation. Here are thousands of facts, often a score of them on a single page, carefully documented, in such profusion as to leave the reader with a sense of repletion tinged with wonder at the assiduity of the writer in the face of the apparent obstinacy of the material to yield the opportunity for the creation of a broad and colorful picture of the London merchant class. One finds that there was nothing static in the elements of mercantile society; that prudence led to investments in scattered pieces of land; that there was a marked lack of continuity in the families composing the class; that successful merchants did not press their sons into trade but sometimes encouraged them into other careers; that prosperous merchants or their progeny moved up in the social scale occasionally just as others who were less fortunate saw their sons drop down. These conditions in the long run, however, appear fairly obvious and would doubtless be found in any mercantile society of the period, but here they are proved and fully authenticated. The major difficulty of the writer of such a book who is confronted with countless data is to master the material and present it along with the conclusions emerging therefrom in an interesting manner, a difficulty increased when the conclusions are either tentative or obvious. Of the mastery displayed by the author of this book there can be no question, but in the presentation of the facts and the conclusions the interest of the reader is maintained intermittently and chiefly by his own hardihood.

Scattered through the text are twenty-one tables summarizing various aspects of mercantile life and illuminating others: origins, geographic or other, literacy, population, numbers of apprentices in certain crafts, the number of heirs, etc., compiled with great care. An appendix of over forty pages present facts on aldermanic families alphabetically arranged; another lists the London landowners in 1436 with location of property and assessment; still another gives the occupation and place of residence of the fathers of apprentices to tailors and skinners drawn from the minutes or registers of the crafts in certain years. There is a bibliographical note listing the main contemporary sources used, printed or in manuscript, and be it said that the latter list is imposing. Secondary works are referred to in the footnotes in amplification of the sources, and are relatively few since almost the entire body of the work is derived from contemporary material in excellent scholarly research.

EUGENE H. BYRNE

Barnard College

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Social Structure in Caroline England. By David Mathew. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1948. Pp. 140. $3.00.)

In 1946 David Mathew was elevated to archiepiscopal rank and appointed Apostolic Delegate to Africa for the Missions of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. It is gratifying to be reassured that these newly-acquired responsibilities have not compelled his abandonment of a distinguished career in productive historical research. And many will note with pleasure his return, following a brief excursus into British naval history, to the field of cultural history in which he has repeatedly displayed eminent competence.

Archbishop Mathew's most recent study is an expansion of the Ford Lectures which he delivered at the University of Oxford in 1945. He states his purpose as "an attempt to estimate and suggest certain trends in the development of the social structure in England during the years of the personal reign of Charles I." Years spent in delving into great stores of unexplored manuscript material, especially the mass of informal documents such as private letters, memoranda, and notes as well as records preserved in the muniment room of many historic English houses, have equipped him with unique insight into the habits, attitudes, prejudices, and ambitions characteristic of the various classes which composed early seventeenth-century society. One chapter which will be particularly enlightening to students interested in this period is devoted to a critical survey of these revealing sources.

Successively portrayed are the social strata ranging from "that closed world" of the Caroline court—now no longer the dynamic center of national life as it had been in the Elizabethan era, though restored to outward dignity and regularity following the frivolous extravagance and disorderliness tolerated by the indulgent James—down to the ranks of casually employed wood-mongers, messengers, coal-heavers, and other menials who formed the nucleus of London's miserable proletariat. While class distinctions were deeply rooted and most folk died in the station in which they were born, social frontiers were hazier and easier to cross than they would be when England took on a more conventional, uniform, and static pattern under the Georges. Consequently it was not too difficult for an enterprising member of a lower class to graduate into a more privileged position. This was particularly true of yeomen seeking to hoist themselves and their families into the squirearchy. The acquisition of an education or outright purchase of an administrative office in the local government were the two commonly used avenues of advancement. The author cites several examples of each approach and his caution against the danger of

unwarranted generalization of these cases is typical of his commendable restraint in keeping within the margins of available evidence.

One of the most satisfying chapters in the book, both by reason of the soundness of the conclusions drawn and particularly for the wealth of suggestions it contains for further research, deals with the emergence of a professional class. Though exceptions were numerous, most candidates for foreign service and the bar appear to have been sons of the gentry, while teachers and physicians were recruited mainly from the yeoman and lower burgess grouping.

Unusually copious footnotes reveal the author's thorough acquaintance with his subject and illuminate his gracefully written text. Many uninitiated American readers will wish, however, that he had explained such unfamiliar terms as 'proprietary school,' 'ushers,' and 'scholars table.'

CLARENCE J. RYAN

Marquette University

The Faith of Reason. The Idea of Progress in the French Enlightenment. By Charles Frankel. (New York: King's Crown Press. Columbia University. 1948. Pp. x, 165. $3.00.)

Although far from being new, the topic chosen by Mr. Frankel is most timely. In our way of thinking, in our conception of life and government, we are still deeply influenced by the intellectual revolution, which started in the sixteenth century, and whose intensity constantly grew through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is assuredly a fascinating task to attempt to analyze the origins and consequences of such a powerful current of thought.

The author, probably on purpose, has limited himself only to the first part of this program. He explains, in a masterly way, the respective influence of Descartes and Pascal upon the ulterior development of "the faith of reason." The first part of the book, devoted to these essential problems, is highly interesting. Then, in a series of chapters which reveal a thorough knowledge of the topic, the reader is successively put in touch with the opinions of Condillac, Helvetius, Holbach, Rousseau, Diderot, Condorcet, and many others. The pages in which Rousseau's ideas are analyzed deserve to be mentioned. Contrary to a superficial opinion, the author wisely remarks that Jean Jacques was not systematically opposed to rationalism. "He wanted intelligence to fill its proper function—to guide rather than to devitalize the emotions" (p. 81).

Mr. Frankel has dealt with the problem from a strictly metaphysical point of view. This approach cannot be held against him, but it must be said that it creates throughout the volume an oddly abstract and almost unreal atmosphere. By completely neglecting the political repercussions of the ideas which he analyzed, he somewhat deprived them of their

warmth and color. It was interesting to recall to the reader's mind the faith of Condorcet in "a future of assured progress." Would it, however, have been superfluous to mention that Condorcet's considerations on human happiness were written in jail during the Terror, and that he finally poisoned himself to escape the guillotine, a victim among so many others of unbridled passions arising from a distortion of the new philosophy? It is, indeed, highly regrettable that Rousseau was dead in 1793; it might have been illuminating to know his reactions when finding out what clever use the Jacobins were making of his mysterious and omnipotent "general will."

As a whole, Mr. Frankel's book is stimulating to thought. A clearer plan and a less ponderous style would have made its reading more attractive.

ROBERT LACOUR-GAYET

St. John's University
Brooklyn

The Pursuit of Robert Emmet. By Helen Landreth. (New York: Whittlesey House. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1948. Pp. xviii, 407. $3.75.)

A good key-word has been chosen for the title of this book, for "pursuit" gives promise of mystery, melodrama, and withal, good history. Miss Landreth fulfills that promise. In her introduction she speaks of sealed boxes of documents long kept secret in the tower of Dublin Castle—some since destroyed, others scattered, many found and used now for the first time. In an early chapter on "Informers and How They Are Made," she states that she has deposited with the Keeper of the Public Record Office in Dublin "a sealed envelope giving the real names" of mercenary informers of Emmet's time whom she has identified. There is the spirit of the detective in her work. It was while turning over the pages of old letters in Trinity College Library, the Royal Irish Academy, the National Library, the Irish Public Record Office, and the Irish State Paper Office, that she realized she had stumbled upon a mystery. "For reasons that will become apparent, the true story of Robert Emmet's insurrection that took place in 1803 had never before been told. . . ." Those words, "the true story," make the reader a little wary. But the reasons *do* become apparent and the claim seems just.

Emmet's rebellion was for long made to appear as little more than a "mere ebullition of a few fanatical politicians," and Emmet himself as a cowardly egoist. Miss Landreth's evidence rather proves that Emmet, impractical idealist though he was, rose as the personification of national aspirations, and, although victimized by the government, came within an ace of placing himself at the head of widespread revolution. Wolfe Tone

and 1798 had been used by Pitt to scare the Irish gentry in the Union. Robert Emmet and 1803 were now used to prepare the way for suspension of habeas corpus in anticipation of renewal of the war with France, and there is indirect evidence that Emmet "had been selected—perhaps months before and very possibly by Pitt,—as the symbol of Irish nationalism."

Emmet's rising has the elements of true tragedy. Informers keeping the Castle aware of his every move, *agents provocateurs* encouraging his plotting, his romance with Sarah used in an attempt later to discredit him, the failure of the rising through bad timing and treachery, the hunt for its leader, his trial, the efforts to blacken his character, that famous last speech from the dock, his execution—all portray in tragic terms the brief career of an Irish hero.

Miss Landreth considers him such and it is, indeed, a tribute to her historical sensibility that she succeeds in restraining hero-worship and the consequent bitterness with which Irish history is so often distorted. There are villians in the piece. Informers, sometimes in a swarm bewildering to the reader, slink in and out through the pages; and the details of their treachery, along with the trickery of government agents, afford a notable picture of the Castle's secret service. The character of Pitt emerges rather tarnished.

The two qualities claimed as the inspiration of Emmet and adopted by the author as her guides are love of justice and belief in democracy. There must have been a temptation to Miss Landreth to over-emphasize the latter and, therefore, to do less than justice to Pitt, to Windham and Marsden, to Plunket and Grattan, who like most of their contemporaries except, perhaps, the oppressed Irish, did not share her own and Emmet's belief in the blessings of democracy. Fortunately, where indictment of Emmet's prosecutors occurs, it is based not on their failure to appreciate his ideal, but on the devious methods they used to thwart and discredit its expression.

In a footnote Miss Landreth writes: "The research necessary to fit Emmet's rising into its proper place in imperial politics has brought to light so much new and important material that it cannot all be presented here. It will shortly be published as a separate book." One looks forward to the fulfillment of that promise. In *The Pursuit of Robert Emmet* the shadow of Pitt hovers ill-defined but ominous in the background while Emmet, largely ineffective save as a tradition, for his brief hour dominates the stage. It will be valuable to see the roles reversed and Miss Landreth is the one to do it.

JAMES A. REYNOLDS

New Haven, Connecticut

The Concept of Empire in German Romanticism and Its Influence on the National Assembly at Frankfort, 1848-1849. By Ulrich Stephan Allers. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. V, 187. $2.00.)

This study offers a valuable contribution to the appraisal of German political romanticism. In his basic discussion the author keeps carefully away from two or three pitfalls which have been obvious in recent treatments of the subject. He neither shares the emphasis on environmental factors, political or geographical (J. Nadler), nor the psychological or psychoanalytical approach which has been favored by some modern American authors. Instead he restores the "dynamism" of philosophical thought to its genuine dignity. His insistence upon the dialectic character of romanticism stresses the conjunction with philosophical idealism and thus aptly avoids another one-sidedness, that of C. Schmitt's "occasionalist" thesis.

More specifically the author concentrates on the concept of empire within German romanticism and on the part which it plays within the thought of Novalis, the Schlegels, Adam Müller, and Joseph Görres. There is not much that can be called original in this analysis, except a somewhat doubtful vindication of Adam Müller's "politics." Moreover, it is admittedly difficult to isolate certain romantic notions from a more comprehensive web of thought. The author, though aware of this problem, has hardly mastered it. His dissertation shows an impressive knowledge of facts, quotations, possible "influences," and so on but little power of discrimination and organization. Of a very timely interest is the attempt to trace romanticist elements in the National Assembly of 1848. Mr. Allers states quite correctly that they were of slight importance in actual policies, and he is also correct in suggesting that the interpretation by Meinecke who saw in the victorious emergence of the empire as "nation-state" a final historic result, is no longer sufficient. There is every good reason to pay renewed attention to the universalistic and supranational elements in German political thought. The opinions of forty-eighters with a genuinely romantic slant which the author registers and discusses give a useful basis for such reconsideration. They would have to be integrated, however, into a broader study of the concepts of nationality in 1848.

Factual mistakes are few and are mostly of a minor character. Hannover does not belong to the area of colonization (p. 104); the Committee of Seventeen was no predecessor of the National Assembly but rather a representation of governments (p. 120); Otto (not Edwin) von Manteuffel was Prussian premier in the 1850's (p. 128). While some references seem to be far-fetched, the translations from the German texts are generally accurate. Unfortunately, no such praise can be given to the pub-

lishing job. Six pairs of pages prove to be out of place and typographical errors are very numerous. Particularly the names in the vast (and unnecessarily inflated) bibliography should have been more carefully checked.

HANS ROTHFELS

University of Chicago

AMERICAN HISTORY

Seeds of Liberty. The Genesis of the American Mind. By Max Savelle. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1948. Pp. xix, 587, xxxi. $6.50.)

The question posed by M. G. St. Jean de Crèvecoeur near the end of the colonial era, "What, then, is the American, this new man?" long awaited a satisfactory answer. Crèvecoeur himself and other students of like mind in the century or more following his death did not have at their disposal the methods or techniques of investigation which are now available for the study of this vastly complex problem. Not until the present generation, the heir of more than a half century of progress in the study of history and the social sciences, were scholars in a position to deal with the French sojourner's famous question in a reasonably precise and substantial manner. Among contemporary historians no one has contributed more significantly to the elucidation of the influences that entered into the American mind than Professor Savelle in his *Seeds of Liberty*, a noteworthy addition to American historiography.

It is not that the author's work is entirely or primarily original. He shows clearly that by the end of the colonial period a widespread consciousness of American uniqueness and individuality had come to prevail among the men and women of competence and distinction in the several fields of cultural achievement. This, of course, is not a new generalization; previous writers have traced the evolution during the colonial epoch of an American nationality in the cultural as well as in the political sphere. But Professor Savelle breaks new ground by the emphasis he places on the years 1740-1760 and by the evidence he amasses to demonstrate the importance of these two decades in the crystallization of the American mind. Not wishing to treat, save incidentally, the revolutionary period which he thinks historians have emphasized at the expense of the earlier years, the author excludes from consideration all colonial Americans born after 1730 except artists and literary figures, many of whom as mere youngsters gave to the American mind in the fields of painting and literature its first genuinely native expression during the 1750's. Though he describes at length the European heritage and the thinking and attitudes of leading colonials in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, he is interested in the early era mainly as the background against which the

continued and steady impact of new world conditions was to weave the pattern of American culture—a pattern clearly discernible in the years covered by the last two inter-colonial wars.

Professor Savelle allows the thinkers, writers, and creative artists of that generation to speak and exhibit their minds. Nearly a hundred pictures and illustrations as well as lengthy excerpts from books and pamphlets help the reader to visualize the richness and complexity of American culture centering on the ideals of liberty and freedom and expressed in religion, science, philosophy, economic, social and political thought, literature, painting and architecture, music and song, and patriotism. Mr. Cyclone Covey of Reed College prepared the chapter, "Of Music and American Singing," which equals, if it does not excel, the fine quality displayed by Professor Savelle in the body of the book.

The pattern of the mid-eighteenth century American mind reflected, the author concludes, the economic and social groupings that had emerged. The Anglophile aristocrats had one set of cultural interests, the frontier democrats another, and the dominant middle class still another. For example, the middle class evoked a realist art whose characteristic note was a simple and plain elegance. Art and nearly every other phase of American culture bore the imprint of religion which exerted a determining, not merely a derived, influence on cultural expression. But only as the rigorous Puritanism of the seventeenth century was modified by scientific rationalism, secularist preoccupation, racial commingling, and frontier revivalism did the new, truly American pattern of culture take on definite form.

AARON I. ABELL

University of Notre Dame

The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development. By Alfred H. Kelly and Winfred A. Harbison. (New York: W. W. Norton Co., Inc. 1948. Pp. xvi, 940. $7.50.)

Since the last publication of McLaughlin's *Constitutional History of the United States,* persons interested in constitutional questions have felt acutely the need for a re-examination of the post-Civil War period. McLaughlin's book, scholarly as it was in the earlier portions, and stylistically satisfactory as it was throughout, was deficient in its coverage of this period. Attempts by Hockett to supply the defect failed with the non-appearance of his projected third volume; Swisher's text, while comprehensive in its narrative, was encumbered with huge and often undigested blocks of material from government publications, notably the *Congressional Record.* A new attempt to tell the story of America's constitutional growth, then, deserves commendation for its enterprising spirit, if for nothing more.

Kelly and Harbison's enterprise, however, has been rewarded in the production of a volume which deserves widespread adoption as a text. It tells, in clear and reasonably concise fashion, the story of American constitutional history from English colonial times to the present. While it might be desirable to see more emphasis on some pre-colonial origins of Amercan institutions, it would be almost insuperably difficult to accomplish such a task as this procedure would impose in a reasonably-sized volume. The discussion of colonial origins alone comprises a sufficiently large portion of the first third of the book to make it possible for the reader to gain an accurate notion of some of the Anglo-Saxon bases for American institutions. One defect may be mentioned here, however; the authors seem unaware of the Anglo-Saxon reliance on written law, preferring to trace this attitude from the seventeenth century only.

In succeeding chapters, the Articles of Confederation are discussed, with a somewhat new arrangement imposed upon the account of their well-known weaknesses, and the Constitutional Convention is then given ample and illuminating treatment. After the Constitution begins to operate, its interpretation and development are made the subject of the remainder of the book. The last chapters carry the account through World War II and the succeeding period practically to the present. No earlier volume can compare with this coverage; even though some of them may reasonably be excused on the basis of the early dates of their publications, they must be regarded as somewhat remiss in failing to give this kind of treatment to much of the Reconstruction era and the years following.

One of the most notable features of the author's discussion of the period between the two world wars, and particularly of the period since 1940, is the number of times they must resort to the use of the qualifying adverb "surprisingly." Repeatedly it is used to characterize the Supreme Court's departure from established tradition, or from patterns which had seemingly been set by the same justices who were now reversing themselves. No better comment could be made on the present court's anomalous position than this record, which Kelly and Harbison allow to speak almost entirely for itself, and which they must, on occasion, fix in our attention by the use of some such expression as the one cited, perhaps, partly because they do not feel themselves qualified to do more.

Stylistically the volume is often tiresome, with four or five successive paragraphs beginning in the same fashion, and with consistently pedestrian language used throughout. What they may have gained in clarity by using this procedure, they have sacrificed in interest. There is nothing like the brilliant and penetrating scholarship of McLaughlin displayed here, only a painstaking, competent, and chronologically complete study. This is, however, a worthy achievement, indeed, and one which will assuredly be welcomed by all who are concerned, as teachers or students,

with the history of our political institutions. The typography, binding, and indexing are all worthy of praise, and it is a great point in their favor that the authors have returned to McLaughlin's practice of a separate, clearly-defined table of cases.

SISTER MARIE CAROLYN KLINKHAMER
The Catholic University of America

American Dreams. A Study of American Utopias. By Vernon Louis Parrington, Jr. [Brown University Studies, Vol. XI, Americana Series No. 2.] (Providence: Brown University. 1947. Pp. viii, 234. $4.00.)

This modest study was submitted to Brown University in its original form as a doctoral thesis in American literature. Its primary concern is social and intellectual history. The "American Dreams" are the flights of fancy that men have recorded, some interesting, some quite visionary, some crackpot, none of any particular literary merit, and all rebelling against the existing order. The name that Sir Thomas More gave to his own dream came to be accepted by them. *Utopia* literally means *nowhere*. That is no more than to say that perfection in governmental matters is always relative.

It was not until the first flush of colonizing enthusiasm had completely worn itself out in the second decade of the nineteenth century that men again found time to dream of utopia. Most of these early novels have only antiquarian interest; they are of little help to the student of social history. The utopian dreams of such men as Hawthorne and Edward Everett Hale, however, have a particular interest because they reflect the times. Men were beginning to realize that the American soil did not provide a universal panacea. They started to wonder why there should be poverty in the country, why there should be depressions. The increasing social consciousness during the period from 1870 to 1900 was reflected in the utopian literature.

The great flood of utopian novels came after the publication of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888). This work caught men's fancy, not because it was original, but because it expressed so well the ideas which were "in the air." In plot, as well as in ideas, it was very close to novels which had been published earlier. Inevitably there were a large number of answers, some enthusiastic, others vitriolic, but all of them displayed the tremendous interest of the late nineteenth century in reform.

Forty volumes were considered by the author for the period between 1883 and 1900. In Chapter XXI and in the excellent abstract of the original thesis in Curtis Garrison (ed.), *The United States, 1865-1900,* II, 408-412, he concluded that twenty-seven novels proposed a modified capitalistic state, five proposed a completely paternalistic almost-

totalitarian state, and four described a communistic state. The twenty-seven socialistic novels varied in every respect save one—and that was their common faith that if men would only work together there would be more than enough for all. Sixteen of these same forty books predicted that the change to a better world would come about slowly as a result of education, while seventeen thought that reform could come immediately. A few thought that the increasing number of monopolies would inevitably make the state socialistic. In other words, there was even less agreement about the path to the better world than about what it should be.

The ferment which the utopians helped to stir up determined the intellectual and literary attitudes of the next generation of writers, the generation not only of Dreiser but of Stephen Crane, Frank Norris, Upton Sinclair, Lincoln Steffens, Edith Wharton, and many others. The influence of these muckrakers has been cumulative up to the present time. Their efforts helped to ruffle the placidity of the early 1900's, and the literature since then has been largely tainted by post-war and depression pessimism. But the writing of the last two decades of any social significance has been largely influenced by the activities of the muckraking generation, and that, again, was largely a carry-over from the utopians that the author considered.

The last four chapters, in all thirty-six pages, which survey the period between 1900 and 1946, are evidently an addition to the original manuscript. They do not indicate the carefulness of selection and the thoroughness of analysis that characterize the previous chapters and make them so readable. A statement such as: "And like Heaven the directions for getting there have been no more specific than the program of entertainment promised upon arrival" (p. 3) is, of course, entirely gratuitous. Part II of the bibliography, "The Utopian Novel in America," contains some useful comments on the utopian novels used by the author for the study. The index refers only to proper names and to the titles of books.

PATRICK HENRY AHERN

Washington, D. C.

GETTYSBURG. Edited by Earl Schenck Miers and Richard A. Brown. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1948. Pp. xviii, 308. $3.50.)

This compilation of writings on the battle of Gettysburg by eye-witnesses was collected by Mr. Brown and edited by Mr. Miers. Otto Eisenschiml and Ralph Newman used this technique on the entire Civil War in *The American Iliad.* Paul Angle's *The Lincoln Reader,* also published by the Rutgers University Press, is a second volume similar in form. The editors are concerned, as Mr. Miers explains in his preface, with the "human docu-

ment" of the battle rather than with military history. Forty-two well chosen authors tell the story in ninety-two excerpts. They include officers' reports, military reminiscences, newspaper stories, diaries of local civilians, participants, and contemporary statesmen. While most of the writings are well known, the selections chosen are carefully fitted together, and they give the reader a series of impressions that he could hardly obtain by perusing the complete works of the writers represented.

We see General Lee through the admiring eyes of ex-Georgetown student John Dooley, captain in the First Virginia Regiment; and Meade is candidly described by General James Rusling. Sallie Robbins Broadhead lived in Gettysburg. Between intervals of listening to the battle and watching friend and foe in the street, she cooked meals as usual and cared for her family. Her husband, who had been in an emergency militia company and had been captured and paroled, picked the last of the string beans in the family garden to keep them from the hungry invaders. Attractive Cornelia Hancock, hesitantly accepted as a nurse by Dorothea Dix because of her appearance, describes the care of the wounded. Billy Bayly's mother made cherry pies for the Confederates who, nevertheless, shot their sheep and carried off their poultry. While Pickett's charge was in progress, some four miles distant, a neighbor woman dropped in to borrow Mrs. Bayly's pickle recipe. Staff Officer Frank Haskell's famous account, which he did not intend for publication, and which appeared after his death in the Harvard Classics, is drawn upon too heavily, in the reviewer's opinion.

The editors do not claim that the battle which they chose to describe was the most "important" or the most "decisive" of the Civil War. They merely state that "Few periods in American history were to become more indelibly inscribed upon the Nation's heart than the bloody days of July 1, 2, and 3 at Gettysburg." Persons intimately familiar with Gettysburg and aware of the great popular interest in this battlefield, attribute much of that enthusiasm to Lincoln's Address. The authors do not include the cemetery dedication in their volume.

Part of Ewell's Corps (p. 4) is described as reaching York by way of Frederick, Emmitsburg, and Gettysburg, rather than through Chambersburg and Gettysburg. The map shows Longstreet in advance of Ewell on the march into Pennsylvania (p. 6). The reverse order is correct. Major General Hood is designated as a brigadier (p. 118). A statement that Haskell served with the Iron Brigade, First Corps, as aide to General Gibbons, might be interpreted to apply to Gettysburg (p. 32). In this battle Gibbons was in the Second Corps. Generally, however, the editor's comments are clear and effective. The book is highly recommended.

J. WALTER COLEMAN

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Code of Canon Law (Canons 375-387) has brought about, over the years, a better understanding in this country of the importance of archives in the diocesan organization. Not all chanceries are able to appoint a full-time archivist, but the care and interest in archives is much greater. It is unfortunate that there is not some similar legislation governing the archives of universities, colleges, seminaries, and charitable institutions. Good administrators are not often good historians and a restraining and guiding law to protect them in the care of their records would be of great service to the future historians of the Church in this country.

Present-day Catholic Action lays great stress on the power of lay men and women in the work of the Church. While formal Catholic Action is something new in the modern world, the principles of lay leadership have been in constant use throughout the history of the Church. In the United States the lack of financial and political power by Catholic lay persons has limited the extent of their influence. Nevertheless, there have been dozens of Catholic lay leaders of the past hundred years in this country whose lives need recording. The first step towards such writing, however, should be the safeguarding of existing records. The best depositories of such material are the libraries of our colleges and universities, particularly those engaging in historical research.

The overcrowding of Catholic colleges and the distractions of war-time services among clerical scholars have proved dangerous to the progress of Catholic historical study in the United States. There are, of course, other factors in the picture, but post-war concessions to the practical on the part of many institutions and organizations will have seriously deleterious effects on Catholic scholarship within the next full century. The present crisis must be met by those trained after World War I, and the future crisis will be faced by the leaders trained now. Preparation for current problems is good only when it does not interfere with the preparation for the future.

January 22, 1949, completes the first fifty years since Pope Leo XIII issued his apostolic letter, *Testem Benevolentiae,* condemning the heresy of Americanism. The papal letter marked the high point in a controversy between two groups of the hierarchy over the adaptation of the Church's external discipline to American ways. One group was headed by Archbishop John Ireland and Bishop John J. Keane; the other by Archbishop Michael Corrigan and Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid.

In the April, 1941, issue of *Seminary Studies* of Mount Saint Mary's Seminary of the West, Cincinnati, an article on the episcopal lineage

of the American hierarchy appeared. There has now been published a more detailed and complete chart entitled *The Episcopal Lineage of the Hierarchy in the United States, 1790-1948,* done by Father Jesse W. Lonsway of Cincinnati. The work consists of three charts showing the lineage as it took its rise from the principal consecrators such as Walmesley, Doria, Bedini, etc. Good paper, clear print, both black and red ink, all add to the attractiveness and clarity of the charts. The booklet's pages are 12x14 inches, which permits the lineage to show in unbroken fashion from the origin to the present time, or to its extinction. There are, moreover, a listing of the exact dates of consecration of all living American bishops, an adequate two-page index of names, and a seniority list by date of consecration of the living American prelates. Finally the booklet contains an insert of a large chart which compresses all the names on a single surface. A few minor errors in names and dates have crept into the text, but on the whole the work has been very well done and all students of American church history will find Father Lonsway's charts of real value as a working tool. The booklet has been brought up to date with the consecration of the Auxiliary Bishop of Erie, Edward P. McManaman, on October 28, 1948. The work is being distributed by Frederick Pustet Company, Inc., of New York and Cincinnati and sells for $3.00.

Yale University has been presented with the William Robertson Coe Collection of Western Americana. The collection of 8000 items ranges from the Spanish explorations of Juan Perez and Fray Tomas in 1774 to about 1890.

Among the papers recently acquired by the Library of Congress those of Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy in Wilson's cabinet and ambassador to Mexico under Franklin D. Roosevelt, seem to have the greatest interest for our readers.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, the new director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C., has announced a significant liberalization of the rules to permit the more general use of the Library's rich collections. Heretofore the Library has been open only to recognized Shakespearean and Elizabethan specialists. The latest change in policy, authorized by the Board of Directors, will thus make the Library available to students working on doctoral dissertations. The new policy will undoubtedly prove a great boon to scholarship. The Folger Library is especially rich in English imprints. It has more of the items listed in the *Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640,* than any other library in the world.

William L. Lucey, S.J., professor of history in the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, is the author of a recently published brochure of ninety-three pages entitled, *History: Methods and Interpretation.* Father Lucey's

work consists of seven chapters which treat the meaning and value of history, its methodology, the external and internal criticism of sources, with a final chapter on the writing and interpretation of American history. An introductory chapter deals with the social sciences. Each chapter is accompanied by a list of readings from both books and periodical literature, and the narrative itself is annotated with references to the sources used. All the major problems which the American historian meets are passed in review, and the brief discussions afford a very handy medium for both teachers and students who are seeking information on the difficulties which beset all workers in the field. The manual can be purchased from the College of the Holy Cross Bookstore, Worcester, Massachusetts, for the sum of $1.00.

A very timely volume appeared in late November in Father George A. Kelly's *Primer on the Taft-Hartley Law. A Moral Analysis.* Father Kelly, who took his doctorate in 1946 at the Catholic University of America, is a lecturer in labor ethics at St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York, and an associate chaplain of the American Catholic Trade Unionists of New York. The book comprises a searching analysis from the point of view of the Church's teaching on labor of all features of the Taft-Hartley law in the form of questions and answers. It should prove of great help not only to Catholics interested in the field of labor but to legislators in Congress who will presumably have in hand either the outright repeal or the revision of the Taft-Hartley measure. Cloth-bound copies sell for $1.75; paper-bound copies at $1.00. They can be ordered from the Christopher Press, Inc., 35 Schio Street, Rochester 4, New York.

Volume III (1948) of *Lumen Vitae,* published in Brussels, carried an article on "The Catholic Evidence Guild in the United States," by William H. Russell of the Catholic University of America. Father Russell, who has been associated with the movement since its inception in Washington, traced the origins of this work from the street preaching technique, first developed in Boston by David Goldstein in 1916, through the establishment in 1931 of the first two units of the guild in Baltimore and Washington. Articles of this kind contribute to our knowledge of the spiritual life of the American Church on which so little has been written.

Continuing the theme of its May issue, the August number of the *Journal of Politics* carries a series of articles on the "Southern Political Scene, 1938-1948".

As has been the custom for the past ten years, the October issue of the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* is devoted to medical history in Ohio.

With the October, 1948, issue *The Review of Politics,* published at the

University of Notre Dame, completed its tenth year. Waldemar Gurian is the editor and Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., and Frank O'Malley are managing editors.

At a dinner meeting of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia on December 9 the Reverend William J. Lallou, of the Catholic University of America, presented a paper on "French Aid towards American Independence" and the Honorable Francis J. Myers, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, on "American Aid to France, 1948".

The University of Notre Dame held its second annual Natural Law Institute on December 10 and 11.

Plans are under way for the holding of a joint American-Mexican historical conference in Monterrey, Mexico, some time next year. The project has won the active support of the University of Nuevo León, where the proposed meetings would take place.

A national historical congress will be held in Brazil in April to commemorate the fourth centenary of the founding of the city of Baía, the capital of Brazil from 1549 until 1763. Impressive celebrations, of an intellectual and civic kind, are planned for the occasion.

Dr. Emilio Ravignani, who directed for many years with great competence the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the University of Buenos Aires, has been forced for political reasons to abandon his post, and has transferred his activities to Montevideo, whose university has founded an historical institute, patterned after the one in Buenos Aires, where Dr. Ravignani may continue with his work. His new address is Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Cerrito 73, Montevideo, Uruguay.

The new District Archive of Angra do Heroísmo, Azores, has been officially created and is in the process of organization. Dr. Manuel Baptista de Lima Júnior, librarian and archivist of the National Assembly, Lisbon, is in charge of the work. The Archive will contain some 10,000 bundles of manuscripts and about 5,000 codices or registers of correspondence, from the beginning of the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. The principal *fonds* of the archive will include the papers of the former Captaincy General of the Azores; the records of the courts of law, the *Misericórdias* or hospitals, the town councils, the county councils (*administrações de concelhos*), and the notaries public; parish registers; papers of the cathedral chapter and chancery office; records of the now extinct convents and monasteries. This archive, one of the largest of Portugal, will be of interest for the history of the archipelago, of Portugal proper, of commerce, of economic history in general, of the Church in the Azores, of South America, particularly Brazil, and of some European

countries. The former residence of the Viscounts of Bethencourt has been acquired for the Archive.

The Reverend Franz Dvornik of Charles IV University of Prague and the Harvard Research Library at Dumbarton Oaks delivered a series of lectures on Byzantine history and political philosophy at the University of Notre Dame during the week of October 24. His latest publication, *The Photian Schism, History and Legend,* was published in September.

Charles E. Odegaard, professor of mediaeval history at the University of Illinois, has been named director of the American Council of Learned Societies.

The editors of the REVIEW extend their congratulations to John J. Meng of Queens College on his election as president of the United States Catholic Historical Society, which took place at the annual meeting on October 26. Mr. Meng served as president of our own Association in 1945 and is well known among our membership.

The New York Society's Volume XXXVII of the *Historical Records and Studies* contains two papers on the subject of the Church and State in the United States, one by Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., of Fordham University, and the second by James M. O'Neill of Brooklyn College.

Arnold L. Rodríguez, O.F.M., a former graduate student in history of the Catholic University of America and for some time connected with the Academy of American Franciscan History in Washington, has been appointed to the faculty of Duns Scotus College, Detroit.

Manoel Cardozo, associate professor of history and curator of the Lima Library at the Catholic University of America, has been appointed to the editorial staff of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies,* beginning with Volume XIII. Francisco Aguilera, assistant director of the Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, is the new editor-in-chief of the *Handbook.*

Father Aurelio Espinosa Pólit, S.J., has been appointed rector of the new Catholic University of Quito. He is well known in the United States, having lectured at a number of American universities, including the Catholic University of America.

On November 15-17 there was held the centennial celebration of St. Charles College, Catonsville, Maryland. The college opened its doors on October 31, 1848, under the presidency of Oliver L. Jenkins, S.S., who had with him to start Father Edward Caton, a deacon, a housekeeper, and four boys as students. This minor seminary under the direction of the Sulpician Fathers has educated hundreds of American priests from many

dioceses during the century of its existence. Its most distinguished alumnus, James Cardinal Gibbons, graduated from the college on July 12, 1857. The celebration in November drew to Baltimore hundreds of alumni and friends of the college, headed by Edward Cardinal Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit, who graduated in the class of 1903, and who was the celebrant of the pontifical Mass on November 16, at which Archbishop Francis P. Keough of Baltimore preached the sermon. The editors of the REVIEW take this opportunity to extend to the faculty and students of St. Charles College their congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. Gordon Gilsdorf of St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, is the author of a brochure of fifty pages entitled, *Wisconsin's Catholic Heritage,* which commemorates the centennial of Wisconsin statehood from the viewpoint of the Catholic history of that area. The foreword has been written by Bishop William P. O'Connor of Madison. Copies can be obtained by writing to the Holy Name Society Office, 15 E. Wilson Street, Madison 1, Wisconsin, and enclosing $.50.

Professor Maurice de Wulf died on December 23, 1947. The third volume of the sixth edition of his famous *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* has been published.

Dom Hugh Connolly of Downside Abbey died on March 16 at the age of 75. He was an Australian by birth. Educated in England, he entered the Benedictines in 1891, was solemnly professed in 1896, and ordained in 1899. He made long studies at Cambridge University, specializing in Hebrew and Syriac. Successor to Dom Cuthbert Butler as superior of Benet House at Cambridge, he lectured in Syriac at Christ's College for some time. Since 1901, over thirty of his articles, especially on patristic subjects, appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies.* He contributed scholarly articles on monasticism to the *Downside Review.* A number of important texts in various oriental languages were edited by him for the Cambridge Texts and Studies and for the Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. His latest studies were made to show that the *De sacramentis* and *Explanatio symboli* are authentic works of St. Ambrose. A critical edition of the latter work was left by Dom Connolly for publication in Texts and Studies.

The distinguished classicist and patrologist, Umberto Moricca, died on July 24. A. Vaccari, S.J., writes an obituary notice of him in the September 18 issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica.*

Sylvanus G. Morley, director of the Museum of New Mexico and the School of American Research, died on September 2 at the age of sixty-five. Dr. Morley was an authority on Mayan hieroglyphics. He began archaeological research in Central America in 1907. The final fruits of

his labors are presented in *The Ancient Maya,* published in 1947. Morley became a convert to Catholicism during his last illness.

Father Charles J. G. Maximin Piette, O.F.M., associate member of the Academy of American Franciscan History, died on November 6. Born in Belgium on October 8, 1885, he entered the Franciscan order in 1904 and was ordained in 1911. During the First World War he served as a chaplain in the Belgian army. After a period in which he taught theology and history, he took his doctorate in theology at the University of Louvain in 1925 and his master's degree in history at Harvard University in 1928. His writings include *John Wesley dans l'évolution du protestantisme,* also published in English; *L'Union des églises; L'Evocation de Junípero Serra, fondateur de la Californie;* and a posthumous study in two volumes, *Le Secret de Junípero Serra.*

Cuthbert Wright, head of the Department of English in Assumption College, Worcester, died on November 28 at the age of forty-nine. Professor Wright contributed book reviews from time to time to the REVIEW and was for some years a member of our Association.

The death is announced of the Reverend Lionel Franca, S.J., rector of the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. Father Franca was one of the outstanding members of the Brazilian clergy, and his contributions to scholarship have been numerous.

John J. Wynne, S.J., one of the best known Jesuits in the United States, died in New York on November 30 at the age of eighty-nine. He had been a Jesuit for seventy-two years. Father Wynne was the founder in 1909 and first editor of *America,* a member of the editorial board of the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* vice-postulator of the cause of St. Isaac Jogues and the other North American Jesuit martyrs, as well as vice-postulator for the cause of Kateri Tekakwitha. He was the author of *The Jesuit Martyrs of North America* (New York, 1925), and translator and editor of *The Great Encylicals of Pope Leo XIII* (New York, 1903). Father Wynne was active in many causes which advanced scholarship and learning in the United States and for years he was a faithful member of our Association.

In Volume XVIII (1946-1948) of *Byzantion,* Robert P. Blake published a detailed obituary notice of Samuel Hazzard Cross.

A tribute to Archibshop James H. Ryan appears in the July number of *Speculum.*

A lengthy obituary notice on the Most Reverend Paschal Robinson, apostolic nuncio to Ireland, was published in the October number of the *Provincial Annals* (Province of the Most Holy Name, Order of Friars Minor, New York).

Documents:

Ein neuer Xaveriusbrief. Georg Schurhammer (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Vol. XVI, Fasc. I-II).—Lettres de Christophe du Plessis à Laurent de Brisacier. Henri Sy (*Neue Zeitshrift fuer Missionswissenschaft* [*Nouvelle revue de science missionaire*], Fasc. 4, 1948).—Contract for the High Altar of San Agustín, Mexico City, 1697. (*Americas,* Apr.).—Contract for the High Altar of the Augustinian Church, Metztitlan, Hidalgo, 1696. (*ibid.*).—Contract for the Choir of San Agustín, Mexico City, 1701. (*ibid.*).—Contract for the Choir of San Francisco, Mexico City, 1715. (*ibid.*).—Memoirs of a Hessian Conscript: J. G. Seume's Reluctant Voyage to America. Trans. by Margarete Woelfel (*William and Mary Quart.,* Oct.).—A Contemporary View of the Acadian Arrival in America. William D. Hoyt, Jr. (*ibid.*).—Philadelphia and the Revolution. Trans. by Jules A. Baisnée and John J. Meng (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Soc.,* Sept.).—Senator Beveridge, J. Franklin Jameson, and John Marshall. Ed. by Elizabeth Donnan and Leo F. Stock (*Mississippi Valley Histor.* Rev., Dec.).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Role of the Self-evident in History. Anders Nygren (*Jrn. of Religion*, Oct.).

Spiritual Teachings in Islam: A Study. Joachim Wach (*ibid.*).

Weltwoche und tausendjähriges Reich. Alfred Wikenhauser (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1947, No. 4).

Zum Namen der Rota romana. Jakob Gemmel (*ibid.*).

Absolutism and Relativism in Philosophy and Politics. Hans Kelsen (*American Political Science Rev.*, Oct.).

The Basis of the Suarezian Teaching on Human Freedom. Thomas U. Mullaney (*Thomist*, Oct.).

Christian Co-operation: Papal Pronouncements. (*Clergy Rev.*, Oct.).

Sinai Sheds New Light on the Bible. Henry Field (*National Geographic Mag.*, Dec.).

Estudios sobre escultura romana en los museos de España y Portugal. A. Garcia y Bellido (*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, Vol. LIII, No. 3).

The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word *Ecclesia*. J. Y. Campbell (*Jrn. of Theolog. Studies*, July).

Sozomen, *Ecclesiastica Historia*, I. 15. Norman H. Baynes (*ibid.*).

Athanasius, *De Decretis* XL. 3. H. Chadwick (*ibid.*).

The Origins of Prime. O. Chadwick (*ibid.*).

Les ex-voto de Khosrau Aparwez à Sergiopolis. Paul Peters (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Vol. LXV, 1947).

Die "Acta Xanthippae et Polyxenae" und die Paulus-Akten. Erik Peterson (*ibid.*).

Le Synaxaire grec de Chifflet retrouvé à Troyes (manuscrit 1204). François Halkin (*ibid.*).

Un opuscule inédit du cardinal Bessarion. Le panégyrique de S. Bessarion, anachorète égyptien. Pierre Joannou (*ibid.*).

Une source insulaire d'additions à un manuscrit du martyrologe hiéronymien. Paul Grosjean (*ibid.*).

Intactam sponsam relinquens. A propos de la Vie de S. Alexis. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*ibid.*).

La Vie de saint Ode d'Amay. Maurice Coens (*ibid.*).

Les premières versions occidentales de la légende de Saidnaia. Paul Devos (*ibid.*).

La Penitencia pública en los primeros siglos de la iglesia. Pablo Fernández (*Unitas*, Vol. 21, No. 3).

Qué hay de cierto en la Vida de Santa Cecilia? Rafael Montejano y Aguiñaga (*Christus*, Oct. and Nov.).

Antichità cristiane. La basilica di papa Marco. A. Ferrua (*La civiltà cattolica*, Sept. 4, No. 2357).

Studi petrarcheschi. A. Costa (*ibid.*).

La missione pontifica presso i Copti sotto Gregorio XIII. G. Castellani (*ibid.*, Oct. 2, No. 2359 and Oct. 16, No. 2360).

Il Bolscevismo e l'odierna crisi mondiale. (Tra la pace e la guerra). S. Lener (*ibid.*, Oct. 16, No. 2360).

Capítulos de un libro, Aurelio Prudencio. Angel Custodio Vega (*La Ciudad de Dios*, Vol. CLX, No. 1).

La philosophie de saint Augustin. G. Bardy (*L'année théologique*, 1947, Fasc. IV).

Le mysticisme du P. d'Alzon d'après son Directoire. F. Cayré (*ibid.*).

L'intuition intellectuelle dans la philosophie de saint Augustin. F. Cayré (*ibid.*).

L'entrée de la philosophie dans le dogme au IV^e siècle. G. Bardy (*ibid.*, 1948, Fasc. I).

Chateaubriand and St. Augustine. Liam Brophy (*Irish Eccles. Record*, Sept.).

Palestine and the Holy Places. Paul Walsh (*ibid.*, Oct.).

St. Malachy of Armagh. Aubrey Gwynn (*ibid.*, Nov.).

The Incarnation—a Supreme Exaltation for Christ according to St. John Damascene. Dominic J. Unger (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).

Remigius-Nemesius. Ignatius Brady (*ibid.*).

Petrus Thomae on the Stigmata of St. Francis. Gaudens E. Mohan (*ibid.*).

Les personnages du nom de Bernard dans la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle. Léon Levillain (*Le moyen âge*, No. 3-4, 1947).

Chroniques espagnoles et chansons de geste. Jules Horrent (*ibid.*).

Salvus of Albelda and Frontier Monasticism in Tenth-Century Navarre. C. J. Bishko (*Speculum*, Oct.).

The *Annales Paulini*. H. G. Richardson (*ibid.*).

Educational Theory in the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury. D. D. McGarry (*ibid.*).

The Hippodrome at Byzantium. Rodolphe Guilland (*ibid.*).

The Date and Nature of the Spanish *Consensoria Monachorum*. C. J. Bishko (*Amer. Jrn. of Philol.*, Oct.).

Le origini dell'agiografia: i Bollandisti. Serafino Prete (*Convivium*, 1948, No. 3).

Intorno alla leggenda di S. Alessio. Giacomo Osella (*ibid.*, No. 4, 1948).

Umanità di Rosvita. Gustavo Vinay (*ibid.*).

The Genesis of the Crusades: The Encyclical of Sergius IV (1009-1012). Alexander Gieysztor (*Medievalia et humanistica*, Fasc. V, 1948).

Medieval History and Historians during World War II. Loren MacKinney (*ibid.*).

Robert Grosseteste and Richard Fournival. Alexander Birkenmajer (*ibid.*).

A Note on Dominici's Sources. Richard H. Crum (*ibid.*).

The Renaissance: 1939-1945. L. Bradner (*ibid.*).

The Influence of Jean Bodin's *République* on English Political Thought. George L. Mosse (*ibid.*).

Der Reformator Johannes Hessius als humanistisch gerichteter Büchersammler. Paul Lehman (*ibid.*).

Medieval Exegesis. James M. Vosté (*Catholic Biblical Quart.*, July).

The Commentary of St. Paul of the Codex Arsenal Lat. 534 and Baldwin of Canterbury. Arthur Landgraf (*ibid.*, Oct.).

L'esthétique chez les écrivains médiévaux. J. de Ghellinck (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Sept.).

The Theory of Public Law and the State in the Thirteenth Century. Gaines Post (*Seminar* [*The Jurist*] Vol. VI, 1948).

Addenda to the Catholic University Edition of the Decrees of the Council of Trent. Stephan Kuttner (*ibid.*).

Intorno alla "romanità" di Natale Alexandre Ord. Praed. A. Mercati (*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, Vol. XVI, 1946).

Die Sätze der Londoner Verurteilung von 1286 und die Schriften des Mag. Richard von Knapwell, O.P., F. Pelster (*ibid.*).

Le manuel de conversation de Philippe de Ferrare, O.P., R. Creytens (*ibid.*).

L'architecture dominicaine au XIII[e] siècle. Législation et pratique. G. Meersseman (*ibid.*).

Aux origines du valdéisme. Une profession de foi de Valdès. A. Dondaine (*ibid.*).

St. Joseph of Leonissa. Isidore Mausolf (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Dec.).

Four Capuchin Vicars-General, 1574-1593. Armand Dasseville and Ronald Jansch (*ibid.*).

Del epistolario espiritual de Arnaldo de Vilanova. J. Carreras Artau (*Estudios Franciscanos*, Vol. 49, No. 271).

Cooperación misional en el siglo XIV. Recaudación de limosnas para las Misiones franciscanas de Oriente. Lazaro de Aspurz (*ibid.*).

Ramón Lull y la Sociedad de las Naciones. Andrés de Palma de Mallorca (*ibid.*, Vol. 49, No. 272).

San Lorenzo de Brindis y la contra-reforma. Antonio M. a de Barcelona (*ibid.*).

Cultural Relations in the Middle Ages: Nicholas Trevet and Nicholas of Prato. Ruth J. Dean (*Studies in Philology*, Oct.).

Gli Annali Gregoriani di Gian Pietro Maffei. Premesse storiche per una revisione critica. Pietro Pirri (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, Vol. XVI, Fasc. I-II).

Papal Efforts toward Protestant Representation at Trent. Stephan Kuttner (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

Francis Suarez. Heinrich Rommen (*ibid.*).

The Religious Revolt: Protestant Version. Thomas P. Neill (*America*, Oct. 2).

Christianisierung und katholische Mission in Island. E. Krenn (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* [*Nouvelle Revue de science missionaire*], No. 4, 1948).

Die Peitang Bibliothek in Peking. J. Beckmann (*ibid.*).

Rome et l'Indochine. E. Beaupin (*ibid.*).

Spuren christl. Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran; VII. Die Lehre von den bösen Geistern. J. Henninger (*ibid.*).

The Church in Hawaii. Charlotte M. Kelly (*Studies. An Irish Quart. Rev.*, Sept.).

EUROPEAN

Die geistige Grundlage einer europäischen Völkergemeinschaft. Otto Schilling (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1947, No. 4).

La chronologie du régne de Clovis d'après la légende et d'après l'histoire. André von de Vyver (*Le moyen âge*, No. 3-4, 1947).

Une charte inédite du X[e] siècle: Donation à Saint-Géraud d'Aurillac par Aldegarde, comtesse, douairière d'Angoulême. Roger Grand (*ibid.*).

La pseudo-trêve de Dieu de Montherond. R. Bonnaud-Delamare (*ibid.*).

Description de la France catholique. Gabriel Le Bras (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Sept.).

Los ascendientes de San Rosendo. (Notas para el estudio de la monarquía asturleonesa durante los IX y X.). Emilio Sáez (*Hispania. Revista española de historia*, 1948, No. XXX).

El adelantamiento de Cazorla durante la edad media. Juan Francisco Rivera (*ibid.*).

Sobre la fecha de la muerte de Alfonso V de Léon. Alfonso Sánchez Candeira (*ibid.*).

Documento inédito de Alfonso IX (5 marzo 1194). Alfonso Andrés (*ibid.*).

A Hebrew Elegy on the Martyrs of Toledo, 1391. Cecil Roth (*Jewish Quart. Rev.*, Oct.).

El Monasterio de El Escorial, sus arquitectos y artífices. Luciano Rubio (*La Ciudad de Dios*, Vol. CLX, No. 1).

El Procurador de la Compañia de Jesús en la corte de España. Félix Zubillaga (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, Vol. XVI, Fasc. I-II).

The Historian of the Spanish Empire [Roger Bigelow Merriman]. Garrett Mattingly (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Il P. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio e il Risorgimento italiano. A. Messineo (*La civiltà cattolica*, Sept. 4, No. 2357).

Le celebrazioni del trentennio della Gioventù Femminile di Azione Cattolica Italiana. (*ibid.*, Sept. 18, No. 2358).

Attualità di un grande deluso: Giuseppe De Maistre. D. Mondrone (*ibid.*, Oct. 2, No. 2359).

Romania. Persecuzione religiosa. (Nostra corrispondenza). (*ibid.*, Oct. 16, No. 2360).

Falsification of a Source in Risorgimento History. Carroll Quigley (*Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, Sept.).

Unfreezing Research Materials in the United States: Russian Historical Sources as Illustrative Example. F. S. Rodkey (*ibid.*).

Historical Publication since 1939 on the French Revolution. Beatrice F. Hyslop (*ibid.*).

Abbot Tosti, the Last of the Neo-Guelphs. Sister Claire Lynch (*Histor. Bulletin*, Nov.).

The Constitution of the Italian Republic. Mario Einaudi (*American Political Science Rev.*, Aug.).

The Italian General Election. Daniel A. Binchy (*Studies. An Irish Quart. Rev.*, Sept.).

Rebirth of a Cathedral (Cologne). Martin J. Hillenbrand (*America*, Oct. 30).

On the Future of Germany. Waldemar Gurian (*Commonweal*, Nov. 5).

Alexander Bach and the Leseverein in the Viennese Revolution of 1848. Minna R. Falk (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, July).

Public Opinion during the Viennese Revolution of 1848. R. John Rath (*ibid.*).

Eighteen Forty-Eight in the Rumanian Principalities. John C. Campbell (*ibid.*).

Poznan and Europe in 1848. C. E. Black (*ibid.*).

England and the First Partition of Poland. Wladyslaw Konopczyński (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Apr.).

The Historical Development of the Danubian Problem to the Present. Joseph de Somogyi (*ibid.*).

Herzen, Bakunin, and the Polish Insurrection of 1863. M. K. Dziewanowski (*ibid.*).

The People of Yugoslavia. C. S. Milanovich (*Social Justice Rev.*, Nov.).

The Strength and the Weaknesses of the Soviet Union. N. S. Timasheff (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

The Year 1848 in German History: Reflections on a Centenary. Friedrich Meinecke (*ibid.*).

Red Russia and the Catholic World. Nicholas D. Chubaty (*Ukrainian Quart.*, Vol. IV, No. 3).

Some Recent Books on Russia. Anthony F. Czajkowski (*Histor. Bulletin*, Nov.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Teaching of English History. Herbert Butterfield (*Cambridge Jrn.*, Oct.).

Doctor Johnson on History. Godfrey Davies (*Huntington Library Quart.*, Nov.).

East Anglian Commendation. Barbara Dodwell (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

Master Philip the Notary and the Fortieth of 1199. C. R. Cheney (*ibid.*).

The 'Narratio Historica' of P. Vincentius, 1553. Denys Hay (*ibid.*).

Irish Culture in the Seventh Century. Françoise Henry (*Studies.* Sept.).

J. O'Donovan and "Annals of Four Masters". H. Concannon (*ibid.*).

Ireland's Links with Compostella. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).

Charles Dickens and Thomas Moore. Donal O'Sullivan (*ibid.*).

Life in an Ancient Irish Monastery. Martin P. Harney (*Histor. Bulletin*, Nov.).

From Canterbury to Lichfield. S. M. Kuhn (*Speculum*, Oct.).

Master Odo of Cheriton. A. C. Friend (*ibid.*).

A Chaucer Scribe's Concern with Page Format. T. A. Stroud (*ibid.*).

Some Observations on the Early English Psalters and the English Vocabulary. A. Laurence Muir (*Mod. Lang. Quart.*, Sept.).

Robert Barton of Ovir Barnton. A Scottish Merchant of the Sixteenth Century. W. Stanford Reid (*Medievalia et humanistica*, Fasc. V, 1948).

Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution. Charles F. Mullet (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography. Arthur Friedman and Louis A. Landa (*Philological Quart.*, Apr.).

Heralds of the Second Spring: Cardinal Action. Denis Gwynn (*Clergy Rev.*, Oct.).

Heralds of the Second Spring: Frederick Lucas. Denis Gwynn (*ibid.*, Nov).

Middle Class Education. W. J. Battersby (*Month*, Sept.).

AMERICAN

The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia: Religion and Society in the Early Literature. Perry Miller (*William and Mary Quart.*, Oct.).

Johann Friedrich Amelung at New Bremen. Dorothy Mackay Quynn (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Sept.).

Some Maryland Lawyers in Supreme Court History. Philip B. Perlman (*ibid.*).

The Founding of Mount Saint Mary's College, 1808-1835. Thomas F. O'Connor (*ibid.*).

Labor Controls in Maryland in the Nineteenth Century. Richard B. Morris (*Jrn. of Southern Hist.*, Aug.).

Early Catholic Secondary Education in Philadelphia. V. M. (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).

Non-Catholic Regard for Archbishop Ireland. Wallace K. Hermes (*ibid.*).

Catholics in the Period of the American Revolution. Charles H. Metzger (*ibid.*).

The Catholic Church in the United States, 1852-1868: A Survey. Francis J. Tschan (*ibid.*).

Freeman's Oath. Andrew E. Nuquist (*Vermont Quart.*, Apr.).

How Many Presidents Have There Been? Lawrence J. Kenny (*Histor. Bulletin*, Nov.).

History of Congressional Reapportionment. Sister Mary Consolata Jennings (*Histor. Bulletin*, Nov.).

The Background of the Chicago River and Harbor Convention, 1847. Mentor L. Williams (*Mid-America*, Oct.).

Cadillac at Detroit. Jean Delanglez (*ibid.*).

The Cartography of the Mississippi. Jean Delanglez (*ibid.*).

Toward a Western Literature, 1820-1860. David Donald and Frederick A. Palmer (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Dec.).

The First Polish Book Printed in the United States. Sister M. Liguori (*Polish American Studies*, Jan., 1948).

The Franciscan Sisters of St. Joseph. Sister M. Edwina (*ibid.*).

Father Francis Xavier Tschenhens, C.SS.R., a Pioneer Priest, 1832-1877. John Lenhart (*Social Justice Rev.*, Oct.-Dec.).

Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects. (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).

Presents to Indians along the French Frontiers in the Old Northwest, 1748-1763. Wilbur R. Jacobs (*Indiana Mag. of Hist.*, Sept.).

Un singulier historien du Canada [Henry-Louis-Armand Potier de Courcy]. Robert Sylvain (*La Revue de l'Université Laval*, Oct.).

Salvador de Ocampo, A Mexican Sculptor. Heinrich Berlin (*Americas*, Apr.).

The Terra Australis—A Franciscan Quest. I. Celsus Kelly (*ibid.*).

Cochineal Production and Trade in New Spain to 1600. Raymond L. Lee (*ibid.*).

The "Real Author" of the RECIT. Francis Borgia Steck (*ibid.*).

Writings on United States Catholic History: 1947. A Selective Bibliography. Thomas F. O'Connor (*ibid.*).

Albuquerque in the 1870's. Victor Westphall (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Puritan and Apache: A Diary. Frank D. Reeve (*ibid.*).

Pinos Altos, New Mexico. R. S. Allen (*ibid.*).

Juan Bernardo Elbers and the Introduction of Steam Navigation on the Magdalena River. Robert L. Gilmore and John P. Harrison (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

Latin-American Projects to Aid Mexico during the French Intervention. Robert W. Frazer (*ibid.*).

An Episode in the Seven Years' War: A Memoir of Jacques Cazotte concerning the Capture of Guadeloupe by the English. Edward P. Shaw (*ibid.*).

Enumeration of the Florida Spanish Missions in 1675. Mark F. Boyd (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, Oct.).

Pretensiones norteamericanas a la Florida (1802-1804). J. Delgado (*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, Vol. LIII, No. 3).

Pedro de la Piñuela, O.F.M., Mexican Missionary and Author. Antonio Sisto Rosso (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).

La raíces ideológicas de Hidalgo y de nuestra revolución de Independencia. Juan Hernández Luna (*Filosofiá y letras*, Vol. XV, No. 29).

El erasmismo de Zumárraga. José Almoina (*ibid.*).

Estudios sobre las fuentes de conocimiento del derecho indiano. Penetración del derecho castellano en la legislación indiana. Rafael Altamira (*Revista de historia de América*, June).

La psicología de Bolívar a través de sus retratos. Gustavo Adolfo Otero (*Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Historia,* Vol. XXVIII, No. 71).

Contribuciones a la historia del Arte en el Ecuador.—San Agustín. J. G. Navarro (*ibid.*).

El Arzobispo de Charcas, Fray Gaspar de Villarroel. Hugo Moncayo (*ibid.*).

Contribución al estudio de la imprenta en América. Cristóbal de Gangotena y Jijón (*ibid.*).

El gran historiador de Bolívar, Vicente Lecuna, eminente Venezolano. A. I. Chiriboga (*ibid.*).

Jésuites wallons, flamands, français, missionaires au Paraguay, 1608-1767. Pierre Delattre and Edmond Lamalle (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Vol. XVI, Fasc. I-II).

La misión del historiador José de J. Núñez y Domínguez en archivos de Europa (1937-1939). (*Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia,* Tomo II, 1941-1946).

Noticias sobre algunos archivos hispanoamericanos. María Castelo de Zavala (*ibid.*).

La función económica del encomendero en los orígenes del régimen colonial. Nueva España (1525-1531). José Miranda (*ibid.*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adhémar, Jean, *Frère André Thevet.* (Paris: Éditions Franciscaines. 1947. Pp. 94.)

Anderson, Robert Gordon, *The City and the Cathedral. A Reflection of the Glory of the Gothic and the Middle Ages at Their High Tide in the City by the Seine.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1948. Pp. xii, 337. $3.50.)

Axters, St., O.P., *La spiritualité des Pays-Bas. L'évolution d'une doctrine mystique avec une liste des traductions françaises des auteurs néerlandais.* (Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts; Paris: J. Vrin. 1948. Pp. 182. 65 frs.) This slender volume by a professor of the Dominican theological college at Louvain is one of the series Bibliotheca Mechliniensis.

Bedier, Julie, *High Road in Tartary. An Abridged Revision of Abbé Huc's Travels in Tartary, Tibet, and China during the Years 1844-5-6.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1948. Pp. viii, 219. $2.75.)

Bergin, Thomas G. and Max A. Fisch, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1948. Pp. xv, 398. $5.00.)

Berthel, Mary Wheelhouse, *Horns of Thunder. The Life and Times of James M. Goodhue Including Selections from his Writings.* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1948. Pp. xii, 276. $3.00.)

Bishop, Morris, *Champlain: The Life of Fortitude.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1948. Pp. 364. $4.00.)

Blum, Jerome, *Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria, 1815-1848. A Study in the Origins of the Peasant Emancipation of 1848.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1948. Pp. 295, xiv. $4.00.)

Bober, M. M., *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. x, 445. $6.00.)

Botsford, George Willis and Charles A. Robinson, Jr., *Hellenic History.* [3rd edition] (New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xix, 509. $6.00.)

Branchi, Camillus E., *The Birth of America. A Contribution to the History of America.* (New York: Vigo Press. 1948. Pp. 62. 1937.) A brochure with three appendices and a bibliography which endeavors to establish the fact that Columbus' discovery fell on October 13, 1492.

Brearley, Mary, *Hugo Gurgeny. Prisoner of the Lisbon Inquisition.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1948. Pp. 176. $3.50.)

Cameron, Sister Mary David, *The College of Notre Dame of Maryland, 1895-1945.* (New York: Declan X. McMullen Co. 1947. Pp. xiv, 219. $3.00.)

Chamberlain, Robert S., *The Conquest and Colonization of Yucatan, 1517-1550.* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1948. Pp. vi, 365. $4.75, paper; $5.50, cloth.)

Chaplin, Ralph, *Wobbly. The Rough and Tumble Story of an American Radical.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1948. Pp. vi, 435. $5.00.)

Chapters in Western Civilization, Vols. I and II. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. viii, 437; 299. $2.50; $2.50.)

Charlotte, Sister Mary, R.S.M., Sister Mary Brendan, R.S.M., and Mary Synon, *A Book of Fortitude. A Collection of the Prose and Poetry which has been part of the Building of America.* (Boston: Ginn and Co. published for the Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. xii, 496. $1.96.) This additional volume of the Faith and Freedom Series is a literary reader for grade 7 with the now familiar attractive illustrations of the series, helps for discussion, etc.

Clark, Thomas D., *The Rural Press and the New South.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 111. $2.00.)

Claudel, Paul, *Poetic Art.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1948. Pp. 150. $2.75.)

Cramer, John H., *Lincoln under Enemy Fire.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1948. Pp. xv, 138. $2.50.)

Cunz, Dieter, *The Maryland Germans. A History.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 476. $5.00.)

Dalberg-Acton, John Emerich Edward, *Essays on Freedom and Power.* (Boston: Beacon Press. 1948. Pp. lxvi, 452. $5.00.)

Davis, Georgene W., *The Inquisition at Albi, 1299-1300.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. 322. $4.00.)

Donald, David, *Lincoln's Herndon.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1948. Pp. xv, 392, xxiii. $5.00.)

Dowd, David Lloyd, *Pageant-Master of the Republic. Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution.* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Studies. 1948. Pp. xiv, 205. $2.50, cloth; $1.50, paper.)

Dunne, Peter Masten, S.J., *Early Jesuit Missions in Tarahumara.* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1948. Pp. 276. $3.75.)

Dvornik, Francis, *The Photian Schism. History and Legend.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1948; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xiii, 503. 35s.; $7.50.)

Edge, Walter Evans, *A Jerseyman's Journal: Fifty Years of American Business and Politics.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 349. $5.00.)

The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation. Writings of St. Augustine, Vols. I and II. (New York: Cima Publishing Co. 1948. Pp. 450; 489. $4.50; $4.00.)

Fawtier, Robert and Louis Canet, *La double expérience de Catherine Benincasa.* (Paris: Librairie Gallimard. 1948. Pp. 368. 550 frs.)

Felder, Hilarin, *The Knight-Errant of Assisi.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1948. Pp. xii, 152. $2.50.)

Ferguson, Wallace K., *The Renaissance in Historical Thought. Five Centuries of Interpretation.* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1948. Pp. xiii, 429. $5.00.)

Fischer, Eric, *The Passing of the European Age: A Study of the Transfer of Western Civilization and its Renewal in other Continents.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. xv, 228. $3.50.)

Fischer, Ruth, *Stalin and German Communism: A Study in the Origins of the State Party.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. xxii, 687. $8.00.)

Freeman, Douglas Southall, *George Washington: A Biography.* 2 vols. *Young Washington.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1948. Pp. xxvi, 549; 464. $15.00.)

Gantenbein, James W., *Documentary Background of World War II, 1931-1941.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. xxxiii, 1122. $10.00.)

Giddens, Paul H., *Early Days of Oil: A Pictorial History of the Beginnings of the Industry in Pennsylvania.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. viii, 150. $6.00.)

Gillard, John T., S.S.J., *The Negro American. A Mission Investigation.* (Cincinnati: Catholic Students' Mission Crusade. 1948. Pp. 95. $.75.) This is a fourth edition of the brochure first published in 1934 by the late Father Gillard. The statistical data have been brought up to 1948 under the supervision of the Josephite Fathers.

Gross, Feliks, *European Ideologies. A Survey of 20th Century Political Ideas.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1948. Pp. xv, 1075. $12.00.)

Halévy, Elie, *The Age of Peel and Cobden: A History of the English People, 1841-1852.* (New York: Peter Smith. 1948. Pp. xi, 374. $6.00.)

Hall, H. Duncan, *Mandates, Dependencies and Trusteeship.* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1948. Pp. xvi, 429. $5.00.)

Hart, James, *The American Presidency in Action, 1789.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xv, 256. $4.00.)

Hartmann, Edward George, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. 333. $4.00.)

Hernández, José, *Martín Fierro. The Argentine Gaucho Epic.* Translated into English prose with introduction and notes by Henry Alfred Holmes. (New York: Hispanic Institute in the United States. 1948. Pp. xxxvi, 193. $4.00 cloth; $3.00 paper). Mr. Holmes has provided the Hernández work with a lengthy introduction and nearly fifty accompanying notes.

Hill, J. W. F., *Medieval Lincoln.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1948; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xvii, 487. $9.50.)

Holmes, Urban T., Jr. and Alex. J. Denomy, *Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Jeremiah Denis Matthias Ford.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. xxxii, 376.)

Hughley, J. Neal, *Trends in Protestant Social Idealism.* (New York: King's Crown Press. 1948. Pp. xiii, 184. $3.00.)

Johnson, Alvin W., and Frank H. Yost, *Separation of Church and State in the United States.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1948. Pp. 279. $4.50.)

Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1746-1747. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1948. Pp. xi, 419.)

Kleist, James A. (Trans.), *The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus.* [Ancient Christian Writers Series, No. 6]. (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press. 1948. Pp. vi, 235. $2.75.)

Knowles, David, *The Religious Orders in England.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1948; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xvi, 348. $8.50.)

Kothen, Robert, *The Priest and the Proletariat.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1948. Pp. v, 64. $1.50.)

Labaree, Leonard Woods, *Conservatism in Early American History.* (New York: New York University Press. 1948; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press. 1948. Pp. xiii, 182. $3.75.)

Langsam, Walter Consuelo, *The World since 1914.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xviii, 969, 113. $5.50.) The sixth edition of a standard text which brings the narrative through the years 1943-1948.

Larsen, Karen, *A History of Norway.* (New York: Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation. 1948. Pp. x, 591. $6.00.)

Leclercq, Chanoine Jacques, *Saint François de Sales. Docteur de la perfection.* (Tournai-Paris: Casterman. 1948. Pp. 270. 66 frs.) The distinguished French writer of spiritual books brings out here a revised edition of his work on St. Francis de Sales.

Logan, George F., *Public Letters by a Private Citizen.* (New York: William-Frederick Press. 1948. Pp. 29. $1.00.)

Loomis, C. Grant, *White Magic. An Introduction to the Folklore of Christian Legend.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1948. Pp. vii, 250. $5.00.)

Macgillivray, J. R. (Ed.), *Letters in Canada. 1947.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Quarterly. April-July, 1948.) A reprint of works published in Canada during 1947 in the fields of poetry, fiction, drama, social sciences, etc.

Marianite Centennial in Louisiana, 1848-1948. (New Orleans: Marianites of Holy Cross, Provincial House. 1948. Pp. 330.)

Maritain, Jacques, *Existence and the Existent.* (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1948. Pp. 149. $3.00.) This answer to Sartre and his school of thought by one of the leading Catholic philosophers of our time will be of interest to many. The English translation has been done by Lewis Galantiere and Gerald B. Phelan.

Martínez, Manuel Guillermo, *Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta: His Place in Mexican Historiography.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1947. Pp. x, 127. $1.50.)

Masterson, James R. and Helen Brower, *Bering's Successors, 1745-1780. Contributions of Peter Simon Pallas to the History of Russian Exploration toward Alaska.* (Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1948. Pp. vii, 96. $2.00.)

McKeon, Charles King, *A Study of the Summa philosophiae of the Pseudo-Grosseteste.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 226. $3.25.)

MacNamara, Robert F., *A Century of Grace: The History of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Parish. Corning, New York. 1848-1948.* (Corning, New York: St. Mary's Church. 1948. Pp. xvii, 283. $3.50.)

Murray, Paul, *The Whig Party in Georgia, 1825-1853.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1948. Pp. vii, 219. $1.25.)

Nevins, Allan (Ed.), *America Through British Eyes.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 530. $6.00.)

Nogues, Dominique, *Mariologie de Saint Bernard.* (Tournai-Paris: Editions Casterman. 1947. Pp. xviii, 236. 54 frs. belges.) The second edition of a work by the Abbot General of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance; the original edition appeared in 1935 and was crowned by the Catholic Institute of Paris.

Ogg, Frederick A. and P. Orman Ray, *Introduction to American Government.* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1948. Pp. ix, 1135. $5.00.) The ninth edition of a standard text in American government, this volume carries its discussion into the field of problems of a post-war government. Its coverage includes the early part of 1948, and there has been substantial revision of the earlier chapters. Materials on governmental problems during the war have been retained.

Palickar, Stephen J., *Slovakia. From Hungarian Despotism to Atheistic Czech Communism.* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Hampshire Press, Inc. 1948. Pp. 138. $2.00.) This account of the troubles experienced by Catholic Slovakia in recent years carries a brief bibliography.

Pingel, Martha M., *An American Utilitarian. Richard Hildreth as a Philosopher.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 214. $3.00.)

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting Held in Worcester, October 15, 1947. (Worcester: Published by the Society. 1948. Pp. 235-370, xxvii.) Besides an account of the Society's activities and the reports of its officers, this Volume 57, Part 2, of the *Proceedings* contains an article of nearly forty pages by Edward Larocque Tinker on "The Cult of the Gaucho and the Creation of a Literature."

Riker, Thad W., *A History of Modern Europe.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1948. Pp. xiii, 835, xxxiv. $6.75, trade price; $5.00, text price.)

Rocamora, J. Luis Trenti, *La cultura en Buenos Aires hasta 1810.* (Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires. 1948. Pp. 156.)

Roche, Aloysius, *A Bedside Book of English Saints after 1066.* (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd. 1948; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. vii, 127. $2.00.)

Roth, Cecil, *The House of Nasi. The Duke of Naxos.* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 1948. Pp. xvi, 250. $3.00.)

Rowe, William Hutchinson, *The Maritime History of Maine: Three Centuries of Shipbuilding and Seafaring.* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc. 1948. Pp. 333. $6.00.)

Royer, Fanchón, *The Mexico We Found.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1948. Pp. viii, 210. $2.50.)

Ryan, John K., *The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 126. $2.50.)

Saint-Martial, Jean de, *Trésors de Rome: témoins de foi.* (Tournai-Paris: Casterman. 1948. Pp. 147. 45 frs.) M. de Saint-Martial here gives a series of brief essays on Rome and its historical monuments. Bishop Louis de Courrèges d'Ustou of Montauban writes the preface.

Samuels, Ernest, *The Young Henry Adams.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. xvi, 378. $4.50.)

Seesholtz, Anne, *Saint Elizabeth. Her Brother's Keeper.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1948. Pp. 136. $2.75.) This brief life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary is very disappointing. The lengthy passages on the politics of the thirteenth century, taken in some cases from doubtful sources, have very little direct relation to the saint. Elizabeth never comes alive in these pages and anyone seeking a fresh account of the great woman will find the book in no sense rewarding.

Segale, Sister Blandina, S.C., *At the End of the Santa Fe Trail.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1948. Pp. xi, 298. $3.00.)

Setton, Kenneth M., *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388.* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1948. Pp. xv, 323. $7.50; $6.00 to members of the Academy.)

Shoemaker, Floyd C., *The State Historical Society of Missouri. A Semicentennial History.* (Columbia: State Historical Society of Missouri. 1948. Pp. 193. $3.50.)

Smith, Robert C., and Elizabeth Wilder (Eds.), *A Guide to the Art of Latin America.* (Washington: Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office. 1948. Pp. v, 480. $1.50.)

Thomas, Sister M. Evangeline, *Footprints on the Frontier: A History of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Concordia, Kansas.* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press. 1948. Pp. xiv, 400. $5.00.)

Thompson, E. A., *A History of Attila and the Huns.* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1948; New York: Oxford University Press. 1948. Pp. xii, 228. $4.50.)

Thompson, Faith, *Magna Carta. Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution, 1300-1629.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1948. Pp. x, 410. $6.50.)

Torpey, William George, *Judicial Doctrines of Religious Rights in America.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 376. $5.00.)

Turnbull, Laura Shearer, *Woodrow Wilson: A Selected Bibliography of his Published Writings, Addresses, and Public Papers.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. p. vi, 173. $2.00.)

Turner, F. C., *James II.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. p. vii, 544. $5.00.)

Ullmann, Walter, *The Origins of the Great Schism. A Study in 14th-Century Ecclesiastical History.* (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd. 1948. Pp. xiii, 244. 18s.)

Von Simson, Otto G., *Sacred Fortress: Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1948. Pp. xv, 149. $10.00.)

West, Robert Frederick, *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 250. $3.75.)

Wilcox, Sister Catherine Joseph, *A Study of Reflections of the Peace Proposals of Pope Pius XII in the Writings of David Lawrence.* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 95.)

Zeeveld, W. Gordon, *Foundations of Tudor Policy.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. Pp. vii, 291. $5.00.)

TRINITY COLLEGE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

A Catholic Institution

for the

Higher Education of Women

In the Immediate Vicinity of the Catholic University of America

Incorporated by an Act of Congress under the laws of the District of Columbia with full powers to confer collegiate degrees.

CONDUCTED BY THE

SISTERS OF NOTRE DAME OF NAMUR

For Particulars, Address

THE REGISTRAR OF THE COLLEGE